

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 1, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, lift our hearts with the abundance of Your love, nourish us with the fullness of Your grace, and encourage us to be open to Your healing power. Help us to reflect Your love to those about us that our lives will be testimonies to Your good spirit and witnesses to an abiding faith. May Your blessing be upon each one of us this day and all our days. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 781. An act to amend the Biomass Energy and Alcohol Fuels Act of 1980 to clarify the intention of section 221 of the act;

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to designate May 7, 1985, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day";

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 21 through April 28, 1985, as "Jewish Heritage Week";

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution designating 1985 as the "Year of Social Security";

S.J. Res. 28. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 8 through September 14, 1985, as "National Independent Retail Grocer Week";

S.J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1985, through November 17, 1985, as "National Rey's Syndrome Week";

S.J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to designate the week of November 24 through November 30, 1985, as "National Family Week";

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 21 through April 27, 1985, as "National Organ Donation Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to designate the year of 1986 as the "Year of the Teacher";

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the week of April 1, 1985, through April 7, 1985, as "World Health Week", and to designate April 7, 1985, as "World Health Day";

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the

month of June 1985 as "Youth Suicide Prevention Month";

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to designate the week of April 21, 1985, through April 27, 1985, as "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week";

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 12, 1985, through May 18, 1985, as "Senior Center Week";

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 1, 1985, through May 7, 1985, as "National Osteoporosis Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to designate the month of November 1985 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month";

S.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1985, as "National Agriculture Day";

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to designate October 16, 1985, as "World Food Day";

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to designate April 1985, as "Fair Housing Month";

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of May 1985, as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month";

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Medicare be commended on its 20th anniversary for the program's success in protecting older Americans against the high cost of health care;

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President respond to unfair trade practices of Japan; and

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol to be used on April 18, 1985, for a ceremony commemorating the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 94-304 and Public Law 99-7, the Vice President appoints Mr. D'AMATO (chairman), Mr. HEINZ, Mr. McCURE, Mr. WALLOP, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. PELL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DeCONCINI, and Mr. LONG as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, the President pro tempore appoints Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. KASTEN, and Mr. MATTINGLY as members, on the part of the Senate, of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC, April 1, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the

Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 4:20 p.m. on Thursday, March 28, 1985, the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate:

- (1) That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 181;
- (2) That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 121;
- (3) That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 160;
- (4) That the Senate passed H.J. Res. 134;

and

- (5) That the Senate passed H. Con. Res. 92.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled joint resolution on Thursday, March 28, 1985:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CERTAIN LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR THE COCOPAH INDIAN TRIBE OF ARIZONA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 730) to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Cocopah Indian Tribe of Arizona certain land in Yuma County, AZ.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 730

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to all valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described tracts of land shall be held by the United States in trust for the Cocopah Indian Tribe of Arizona and shall be part of the reservation of such tribe:

- (1) As part of the West Cocopah Reservation, containing 2,140.91 acres, more or less:

GILA AND SALT RIVER MERIDIAN, ARIZONA

Township 9 South, Range 24 West

Section 18, lot 17;

Section 19, lots 24 and 25; and

Section 30, lots 19 and 27.

Township 9 South, Range 25 West

Section 24, lots 1 and 3 to 12 included;

Section 34, lots 1 and 2; and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Section 35, lots 8, 9, 12 to 26 included, and east half southeast quarter.

Township 10 South, Range 25 West

Section 2, lots 12 to 17 included and 19 to 27 included;

Section 10, lots 1 and 2;

Section 11, lots 5 to 16 included;

Section 14, lots 8 and 9; and

Section 15, lots 5 to 7 included, and northeast quarter northeast quarter.

(2) As part of the East Cocopah Reservation, containing 1,481.68 acres, more or less:

GILA AND SALT RIVER MERIDIAN, ARIZONA

Township 9 South, Range 23 West

Section 30, southeast quarter southwest quarter; and

Section 31, lots 1 to 4 included, northeast quarter, east half northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, and northeast quarter southeast quarter.

Township 10 South, Range 24 West

Section 1, lots 1, 2, 5 to 8 included, south half northeast quarter and east half southeast quarter;

Section 12, northeast quarter and east half southeast quarter; and

Section 13, lots 7 to 9 included, east half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, and south half south half.

(3) As the North Cocopah Reservation, containing 614.18 acres, more or less:

SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, ARIZONA

Township 16 South, Range 21 East

Section 24, lot 1; and

Section 25, lots 7 to 17 included.

Township 16 South, Range 22 East

Section 19, lot 10; and

Section 30, lots 11, 12, 13, 19, 20, 22, and south half southwest quarter.

SEC. 2. (a) Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person or entity of any legal existing right-of-way, legal mining claim, legal grazing permit, legal water right, accretion claim, or other legal right or interest which such person or entity may have in lands described in section 1 of this Act.

(b) That portion of the lands described in paragraph 2 of section 1 which are the subject of a dedication for a garbage disposal recorded at book 167, page 464 of the Yuma County Recorder's office shall remain subject to such dedication for as long as such lands are used for landfill or related purposes.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, Executive Order Numbered 11988 of May 24, 1977, 42 Federal Register 26951, as amended, shall apply to lands described in section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) There are reserved to the United States the following rights-of-way upon, over, and across the lands described in section 1 of this Act:

(1) A right-of-way of sixty feet from the margin of the Colorado River on the international boundary with the Republic of Mexico, as described in Public Land Reservation of May 27, 1907;

(2) Rights-of-way for existing facilities of the Yuma reclamation project, the Colorado River front work and levee system, and the Yuma Mesa conduit;

(3) A right-of-way of fifty feet on each side of the center line of the Pesch header, as shown on the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Yuma project, drawing numbered 35-303-634;

(4) A right-of-way for power and transmission facilities within the north seventeen feet of the south fifty feet of the southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 30, town-

ship 9 south, range 23 west, Gila and Salt River meridian;

(5) A right-of-way of two hundred feet measured horizontally landward from the high water mark of the Colorado River bankline for channel rectification, bankline maintenance, and preservation of the floodway, as well as a right, at all proper times and places, to free ingress to, passage over, and egress from the lands described in section 1 of this Act, for the purpose of exercising, enforcing, and protecting the rights reserved in this right-of-way; and

(6) A right-of-way for sludge disposal for the Yuma desalting plant on sections 24 and 25 (excluding lots 5 and 6), township 16 south, range 21 east, San Bernardino meridian. This right-of-way shall terminate on the earlier of the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act or the date on which the Secretary of the Interior determines that such right-of-way is not needed for such purposes. Any determination by the Secretary of the Interior under this paragraph shall be published in the Federal Register.

(b) In the event that any of the rights-of-way reserved by this section shall be abandoned, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, such rights shall revert to the Cocopah Tribe.

SEC. 5. In the event that title to any private lands located within section 1 or 2, township 10 south, range 25 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, which are contiguous to the West Cocopah Reservation, is subsequently acquired by the Cocopah Tribe, such lands shall thereupon become part of, and shall be within the exterior boundary of, the west reservation of the Cocopah Tribe.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, strike all of line 6 and insert, in lieu thereof, the following: "Northeast quarter southeast quarter, and west half southeast quarter."

Pages 5 and 6, strike all of paragraph (6) of section 4(a) and insert, in lieu thereof, the following:

"(6) An option for a right-of-way for sludge disposal for the Yuma desalting plant on sections 24 and 25 (excluding lots 5 and 6), township 16 south, range 21 east and sections 19 and 30, township 16 south, range 22 east, San Bernardino meridian. This option shall be exercised within five years after the date of the enactment of this Act. The right-of-way, if exercised, shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of the Interior determines that such right-of-way is not needed for such purposes. The rights-of-way which the Bureau of Reclamation currently has in lots 5 and 6 of section 25, township 16 south, range 21 east, San Bernardino meridian, shall be retained. Any determination by the Secretary of the Interior under this paragraph shall be published in the Federal Register."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF MAJORITY MEMBERS AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 94-304, as amended by section 1, Public Law 99-7, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe the following majority Members of the House:

Mr. HOYER of Maryland, cochairman;

Mr. FASCELL of Florida;

Mr. YATES of Illinois;

Mr. WIRTH of Colorado; and

Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 730, the bill passed earlier today on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

TURNING THE BULLS—OR THE HAWKS—LOOSE

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, our President Ronald Reagan rang the opening bell at the New York Stock Exchange vowing to "turn the bulls loose."

I'm not surprised by the President. Since current administration policy is exporting farmers, I guess we really have no choice but to turn the bulls loose.

Nor am I surprised that this President finds it more comfortable at stock auctions, not auctions of farms and farm equipment.

Let's be honest. The President has not turned the bulls loose, he has turned the hawks loose, and left every one else to fend for themselves.

The industrial production index, which is factories and mills, not service industries or consumer spending, rose only 2.9 percent last year. The category of military industries increased production by 13.5 percent last year, four times as much. And last month, military production was the only category to increase.

We know this administration will not cut out any weapons systems, yet the administration, over the objections of every northwest member, will close the Portland office of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Wheat growers in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho will now have to

deal through the CCC in Kansas City, MO. This will hurt them badly. So much for this administration's efforts to increase exports to Japan.

Well, I hope Mr. Reagan enjoyed his trip to the stock exchange, because if the farmers are in depression now, by next year he won't be welcome there either.

GETTING THE KIDS OUT OF THE HOME—AND INTO THE HOUSE

(Mr. DOWNEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we live in a youth culture. The young people of today are everywhere. They're in business, making money as young entrepreneurs; they're in entertainment, singing, dancing, and acting all across America and they're in technology, hacking away at computer terminals. The only place they are not in is politics. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for Congress to remedy this inequity. Therefore, today, April 1, 1985, I propose we amend article 1, section 2 of our Constitution and lower the age eligibility to serve in Congress from 25 to 15.

For too long, Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have pretended this problem did not exist—sometimes even acting younger than our years ourselves in the hope that the country would not miss real youngsters in Congress. But the charade must end. Lower the eligibility and let kids be kids in Congress.

There is a need for new blood in Congress. But lowering the age requirement would add more than just this. Consider the following. It would add new meaning to the term junior Senator. It would bring into this body a new commitment to the concerns of today's teenagers; new congressional organizations like the "What's for Dinner Tonight Ma Caucus," the "Video Game Study Group," and the "Select Committee on Acne" would work for a constituency that has had little voice here.

Mr. Speaker, by the time most Members are here for 10 years, they've had it. By the time most Members have become committee chairmen, they're over it. Imagine if we started at 15, we'd have committee chairmen who would be middle-age instead of megage—and three-term veterans who would just be turning legal age.

Think of the pool of winning candidates it would open up. Emmanuel Lewis, Brooke Shields, the Karate Kid, and all the many Menudos.

No doubt we could expect some problems with a youthful influx; food fights in the cafeterias; smoking in the bathrooms and cutting committee hearings all might increase. But think

of the advantages; junkets could become field trips; the carry-outs could sell twinkies; missed votes could be excused with a note from Mom; and should party discipline ever be a problem—we could send errant Members directly to their rooms and ground them for a week.

Finally, to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, consider what a class of teenage Members would mean for the seniority system.

Mr. Speaker, let's get Americas' kids out of the home and into the House.

DEMOCRATIC RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT REAGAN'S SATURDAY MORNING RADIO ADDRESS

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last I had the privilege of responding to the President's weekly radio address. On that occasion Mr. Reagan chose to promote his policy in Central America. The thrust of my response was to point out that Mr. Reagan's policy is against fundamental American law, and that his actions in Central America are serving to strengthen the Sandinista government which he hopes to overthrow.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a copy of my remarks for the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC RESPONSE OF HON. BILL ALEXANDER TO PRESIDENT REAGAN'S RADIO ADDRESS, MARCH 30, 1985

This is Congressman Bill Alexander. I have been asked to respond to the President and to talk with you today on a subject which is of pre-eminent concern to me and to the people I represent in Arkansas. We Arkansans hold the traditions of our great nation among our highest values. We revere the founding fathers. We learn as small children to quote John Hancock, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and other courageous leaders whose ideals have become the foundation upon which our great nation is built.

These great patriots taught the world that America is the birthplace of peace, liberty and freedom. Throughout our history our nation has shined as a beacon of hope to all those in the world who aspire to the blessings that we Americans enjoy. Now, however, that light has dimmed.

In Nicaragua President Reagan is supporting guerrilla groups intent on the violent overthrow of the government there. While we may not like their government—unilateral intervention violates United States law that respects the sovereignty of other nations, and the right of self-determination. Our own Declaration of Independence condemns "transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation, and tyranny . . ." Mr. Reagan supports the guerrillas who he calls "freedom fighters" even though many of these men were officers of the corrupt dictator Somoza who was ousted by the people of Nicaragua. To support the guerrillas is to return to the past.

For three years there has been a movement to bring about a diplomatic rather than a military solution in Central America. This peace plan is known as the Contadora process which is sponsored by Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia. President Reagan says he supports peace, but his actions sound the trumpets of war. By the end of April we will have about 10,000 U.S. troops in Central America. This costs American taxpayers millions upon millions of dollars.

Peace serves the cause of all nations. Violence leads to the folly of war and the destruction of humankind. If Mr. Reagan's actions are to support peace, he should join with the Contadora nations and endorse the following principles:

- (1) No export of revolution.
- (2) No foreign military bases in Central America.
- (3) Agreed levels of military forces in the region.
- (4) No military ties with any government which is the enemy of peace and freedom.

Mr. Reagan's alliance with violence in Nicaragua is against the American way. The President's actions are contrary to the principles of our founding fathers. The real enemies in Central America are poverty, ignorance, hunger, social injustice and political corruption. The voices of the people are crying out for food, for shelter, for peace, and for justice.

The effect of Mr. Reagan's reign of terror in Nicaragua actually strengthens the Sandinista government he wants to overthrow.

Even if it is the correct policy, Mr. Reagan's three-year old war in Nicaragua has not worked. And, it has cost us millions upon millions of dollars; even worse, we Americans have been made a party to the deaths of thousands of innocent people who have been killed in the war.

Is the United States going to fulfill the fear of Simon Bolivar, the George Washington of Latin America, who worried that:

"Los estados unidos parecen destinados a . . . plagar a la America de miseria a nombre de la libertad."

"The United States appears destined . . . to plague the Americas with misery in the name of freedom."

Or, are we going to provide the leadership which is the mark of a great nation?

Next month my daughter, Alyse, celebrates her 17th birthday. As a gift to her, I am sponsoring Damien Meza Gomez, a five-year-old boy who desperately needs food, medicine and clothing. Damien is a resident of La Esperanza, a small village in the northeast part of Honduras. In Spanish, Esperanza means hope. Mr. President, if you want to provide hope for Damien and thousands of other children like him in Central America, join the Contadora nations in their quest to stop the war.

Thank you and God bless you all.

□ 1210

CONTRIBUTION OF VENTURE CAPITALISM TO NATION'S OVERALL CLIMATE FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INNOVATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENNY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, last year I had the opportunity to chair the first congressional field hearings comparing this Nation's two premier high tech centers, California's Silicon Valley and Boston's Route 128.

Today, for the Joint Economic Committee, I am releasing the first of the two reports that are the outgrowth of those hearings. The first study on the contribution venture capitalism has made to the Nation's overall climate for entrepreneurship and innovation is based on a landmark comprehensive survey of the Nation's venture capital markets.

This report shows that the health of the Nation's venture capital markets receives good marks. Entrepreneurial activities are flourishing as a result of the recent surge of venture capital availability, and the consequence of this is not something that ought to be just considered important for economists; rather, it means that we have had increased jobs in small high growth companies, enhanced international competitiveness and ultimately we have had an improvement in the quality of American lives.

Perhaps the most significant finding for policymakers, however, Mr. Speaker, is the identification of the availability of venture capital as a major factor in assuring entrepreneurship and innovation. Without a doubt this study shows that venture capital is the only means for many entrepreneurial ideas to ever get an opportunity to be tested in the marketplace.

Thus, the level of venture capital funds in the economy is an important barometer or indicator of how strong entrepreneurial activity is. Therefore, I believe the study holds several important lessons for public officials who are faced with major economic decisions.

The report, for example, will serve as a valuable source of information in the anticipated tax reform debate, particularly with regard to capital gains. Each of the three major tax reform proposals treats differently capital gains and, consequently, would have a significantly differing impact on the level of entrepreneurship in the economy. I am hopeful that this report will provide definitive evidence for maintaining some form of differential treatment between capital gains and ordinary income.

Furthermore, the study finds that the tax reform debate will have to ensure the maintenance of incentive-based features. Tax reform, while necessary and while a majority of Members, I am sure, are committed to it, must insure that the entrepreneurial spirit which has pervaded our country for much of its history continues.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is as we move as we should toward a simplification of tax structure, toward overall tax simplifi-

cation, it is important that we keep in mind the growth environment for the economy that can result from proper tax reform; that is, that tax reform can either benefit or it can in a very major way devastate the environment for entrepreneurship in this country. The importance of that is that entrepreneurship is one area in which we have a decided advantage over our major international competitors, particularly the Japanese, and it would be a terrible travesty for us as we move as we should toward tax simplification to make the mistake of forgetting those incentives that are necessary for a growth oriented economy.

I would, therefore, commend to my colleagues' attention the report from the Joint Economic Committee that is being released today called "Venture Capital and Innovation."

FOUR BILLS TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS OF U.S. TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a series of four bills dealing with international trade. These bills grow largely out of recommendations developed by the trade task force of the House Democratic caucus which I cochaired during the last Congress. These bills are designed to address some of the main problems which underlie our escalating U.S. trade deficit, a deficit which reached a record \$123 billion last year. Simply put, we imported \$123 billion worth of goods more than we exported in 1984.

The consequences of this largest trade deficit ever experienced by any country are immediate and serious. Industries are having difficulty developing new markets for U.S. products and competing in existing markets in the international marketplace.

This seriousness of this trade imbalance was not only recognized by our Democratic task force last year, but concern over sagging U.S. competitiveness has also recently been echoed by the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness, headed by John Young of Hewlett Packard. The Commission concluded in its final report that:

A close look at U.S. performance during the past two decades reveals a declining ability to compete—a trend that, if not reversed, will lead to a lower standard of living and fewer opportunities for all Americans.

If current trends continue, this deficit could exceed \$300 billion by 1990. The United States will become a net debtor country this year for the first time since 1919. By 1990 the U.S. external debt could reach \$1 trillion, exceeding the combined total of external debt for the entire Third World.

Shoring up U.S. international competitiveness must involve both short-term and long-term bipartisan policy actions. Steps must be taken at the macro-economic level to create a better climate for economic growth, as well as with respect to individual industrial sectors and their individual needs. The four bills which I propose to you today for your further consideration, I believe, can help us make progress toward creating a better overall economic environment for worldwide economic growth and toward providing the necessary tools for U.S. firms to develop new markets and compete more effectively in the international marketplace.

These coordinated legislative proposals are designed to address four particularly critical facets of international competition which our task force found key—dealing with the inflated value of the U.S. dollar, export promotion, industrial competitiveness, and trade law reform.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH ACT OF 1985

We have all welcomed the economic growth which has occurred in our economy since the end of the 1981-82 recession. It has meant higher profits for many U.S. firms and new jobs for many Americans. Equally important, growth in the United States has provided the world economy a shot in the arm. Increasingly, as a result, the economic fortunes of the rest of the world are tied to how the United States manages its own economy and the leadership we provide internationally in coordinating with our trading partners.

At the same time we are experiencing an economic recovery, real U.S. interest rates remain at historic highs, and the U.S. trade deficit is escalating. Meanwhile, the economies of developing countries that have never been able to recover from worldwide energy and economic shocks of the 1970's continue to suffer under the burden of massive external debt. The continuing strength of the dollar in relation to other currencies exacerbates the world debt problem.

What does all this mean? It means there are very ominous storm clouds on the current recovery's horizon which could wreck devastating economic havoc. Two factors in particular must concern those who are trying to bring about sustained economic growth. The first is that the value of the U.S. dollar is artificially high on international exchange markets. The second is the desperate economic plight of the developing countries.

High real interest rates in our country is causing massive foreign capital flows to move into the United States, thereby inflating the value of the dollar against other currencies. Because of the high value of the dollar,

U.S. goods are less competitive with their foreign counterparts. This is weakening the industrial base of the United States. The dollar's high value is drawing badly needed capital from the developing world and making the job of repaying external debt owed by less developed countries more difficult as they must work all the harder to earn dollars to repay their debts.

This situation should concern us all. The inflated value of the U.S. dollar on international markets is not sustainable. If it falls precipitously, without the United States having taken offsetting actions, the results could be catastrophic. Under these circumstances, interest rates would climb even further, and the economy would be sent into a recessionary tailspin. The stability of the international monetary and financial system is at stake. How the United States manages the current destabilizing situation will largely determine whether our overall prosperity is sustained and our trading partners prosperity is enhanced.

Actions must be taken to reduce the value of the dollar on international exchange markets and to provide stability to the international monetary and trading system.

Many analysts correctly advocate that the best action which can be taken to help bring the value of the dollar down is to reduce the Federal budget deficit, which in turn would bring U.S. interest rates down and make U.S. dollars less attractive to foreign investors. I agree that we must move aggressively on the budgetary front, and in fact will be introducing legislation subsequent to this package to help us achieve this.

At the same time, I am convinced that the relationship between budgetary reductions and movements of the dollar is not entirely linear. Actions by our international trading partners in relation to their own economies and coordinated actions with the United States are needed to moderate the effects of the high dollar on American industrial competitiveness. We may even need to consider international modifications in our monetary system, such as moving to a system whereby currencies are permitted only to fluctuate within a prescribed range before coordinated international intervention in the currency markets would be triggered.

The International Development and Growth Act, which I introduce today, is concerned with development of an orderly program to bring the value of the dollar down and to stimulate growth in developing economies of the world.

There is no one legislative action that can be taken to achieve these difficult goals. Rather, it will require a coordinated set of policy actions on the part of many parts of government in the United States and in coordina-

tion with our major foreign trading partners to effect real progress. I believe my proposal would result in an important step forward in this area.

It first declares that a major objective of U.S. economic policy must be to bring down the value of the dollar. It directs the President to seek negotiations with our international trading partners to help achieve this. As part of this effort, it declares that a major objective of economic policy will be to bring down the size of the Federal deficit. It also directs the Federal Reserve Board to coordinate its actions with other governments to help bring the value of the dollar down. Only by reducing our Federal deficit to take the pressure off the credit markets, and by coordinating actions with our international trading partners, can we hope to make progress on this problem.

The second aspect of this bill creates a high level commission to develop over a year's time recommendations on longer term reforms which should be undertaken to stabilize the international financial system and to stimulate growth in the economies of the world's developing nations. It is in these economies that significant trade expansion is possible. The United States must take an active leadership role to encourage international cooperation to develop this potential and increase trade flows.

EXPORT PROMOTION AND FAIR CREDIT ACT OF 1985

A central part of an U.S. trade policy must be export stimulation. The U.S. Government should, as part of that trade policy, provide U.S. exporters with the kind of tools necessary to compete with their trading partners on an equal footing. The lack of official U.S. backing for exporters is reflected in the fact that the U.S. Export-Import Bank directly finances only 6 percent of U.S. exports, while countries like Japan and France finance somewhere in the range of 35 percent of their exports with official credits.

The preservation of a strong U.S. Export-Import Bank is essential if U.S. exporters are to be able to compete effectively in the world marketplace. More aggressive U.S. exporting is critical to erasing the current imbalance between imports and exports and to future economic prosperity. The export of goods and services accounts for over 10 percent of U.S. gross national product and each \$1 billion in exports represents 25,000 jobs. Foreign governments are to an increasing degree relying on subsidization of their exports, including mixing foreign aid and commercial export credits to obtain artificially low selling prices.

The United States has unsuccessfully tried to negotiate an end to the use of mixed credits by our foreign trading partners. This is reflected in the fact that the number of mixed or tied aid

credits involving both foreign aid and commercial credits offered by foreign governments in 1983 increased by 38 percent from 1982, with their value exceeding \$3.2 billion. According to the OECD, during the first 9 months of 1984, 14 countries offered 238 mixed credits worth \$5.2 billion.

To counter this growing problem, the United States must take action to put American exporters on a level playing field with their international competitors by matching foreign offers of mixed credits. At the same time, the United States must make clear to our trading partners that we will be willing to end our program to match foreign mixed credit offers as soon as an international agreement limiting their use can be concluded.

Concern over the growing use of mixed credits was expressed by Congress when it approved amendments to the Export-Import Bank charter in 1983. That legislation mandated that the Eximbank and the Agency for International Development jointly establish and coordinate a mixed credit program for U.S. exports. However, the statutory language surrounding this effort is vague and the available financial resources to carry it out have been insufficiently identified. As a result, the agencies have not made effective progress toward establishing a workable program to counter the growing use of foreign mixed credits.

This bill amends the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to better enable the intent of the 1983 act to be carried out. First, it establishes a fund in the Eximbank to counter the use of mixed credits by foreign trading partners of the United States. Second, a \$250 million authorization is included for fiscal year 1985 to establish the fund along with a requirement that \$1 billion of the Export-Import Bank's direct lending authority in fiscal year 1985 be reserved for establishing a mixed credit program. Third, an Office of Competitive Export Financing is established in the Export-Import Bank to deal with mixed credits. Finally, the provisions of this bill would terminate if the United States successfully negotiates with foreign trading partners an end to the use of mixed credits.

We must make clear to our foreign trading partners that we cannot continue to tolerate lost markets and jobs because of foreign mixed credit financing. Providing for an aggressive and effective U.S. capacity to counter foreign mixed credit financing is our single best hope for doing so.

TRADE LAW REFORM AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1985

The trade task force concluded that our trade laws were in need of change to be responsive to the needs of U.S. firms and to deal with the realities of the modern day trading situation. Two of the most important problems iden-

tified by the task force involve: First, providing more effective mechanisms under U.S. law to provide adjustment time for U.S. industries to adjust to foreign competition, and second, providing more effective mechanisms to deal with the impact of foreign targeting and other newer forms of foreign trading practices on U.S. industries. The Trade Law Reform and Enforcement Act of 1985 is designed to address these two needs in particular.

This bill contains amendments to section 201 and 301 of the Trade Act of 1974. Under current law, section 201 sets forth the procedures for U.S. industries and workers to obtain temporary relief from injury from increased import competition. It stems historically from a recognition that difficult economic adjustment problems could result for particular sectors of the economy from import competition and that serious injury from such competition should be minimized.

To secure 201 relief, an industry or workers in an industry must petition the International Trade Commission for relief and include an explanation of reasons the relief is needed. The ITC then conducts an investigation to determine whether imports are a "substantial cause" of injury to the industry in question. If the Commission makes an affirmative injury finding, it reports to the President and recommends to the President specific import relief actions he could take. The President is then authorized to provide import relief through tariffs, quotas, or negotiation of orderly marketing agreements. The President has flexibility to determine whether or not to provide import relief, and to direct, if he chooses, expeditious consideration of petitions for adjustment assistance for the industry in question.

This bill transfers the authority for decisionmaking surrounding section 201 cases from the President to the Special Trade Representative to integrate it more effectively with the evolution of trade policy.

The bill makes a number of changes in the existing injury test and causation standard. It replaces the requirement in existing law that imports be a "substantial cause" of injury to a domestic industry to requiring that they just be a "cause." This change is in line with GATT—currently the United States retains a stiffer test on this point than do most of our trading partners.

The bill also adds a threat of injury test which requires the International Trade Commission to consider acts, policies, or practices of exporting countries intended to increase the competitiveness of a given article in world markets; the extent to which the U.S. market is the focal point for diversion of exports through Third World markets; and the inability of producers in a domestic industry to

generate adequate capital to finance modernization of plant and equipment and to conduct research and development.

The bill requires the ITC to establish government-labor-management adjustment advisory groups for petitioning industries if it is requested in the petition that such a group be established. This is designed to provide a mechanism for government, management, and labor of an impacted industry to develop a consensus on what goals are needed to successfully adjust to realities facing them, and to develop a plan for accomplishing the adjustment goals.

The bill also establishes a permanent sectoral research and monitoring capability at the International Trade Commission to evaluate the industrial and trade policies of other countries and their effects on U.S. industries, trade and employment. They would make an annual report to the Congress. The Special Trade Representative would then convene special labor-management-government sector advisory panels which would then make recommendations to the Special Trade Representative of actions which need to be taken to deal with foreign practices impacting on key industries.

Section 301 currently provides the President broad power to enforce U.S. rights against unjustifiable or unreasonable foreign trade practices which burden, restrict, or discriminate against U.S. commerce. Parties must file a petition with the USTR requesting the President to take action and setting forth the allegations in support of the request. The USTR reviews the petition and determines whether or not to initiate an investigation. If the problem cannot be dealt with through negotiation, the USTR is required to make a recommendation to the President for action to deal with the problem. The President also has broad authority to act with or without a recommendation if he deems it appropriate.

This bill also, like the 201 section, would transfer authority to the USTR for administration of the 301 law.

The bill also makes injurious industrial targeting actionable under section 301, and sets up a definite time limit for resolving a claim. The USTR must take final action within 11 months after a petition is initiated if injurious industrial targeting is found. Definite deadlines are established in this section for involvement of the International Trade Commission in determining targeting.

Unless U.S. trade laws are updated and effective in their application to modern day trading circumstances, U.S. firms will continue to fall victim to foreign predatory practices. This proposal is an effort to make our trade more flexible, relevant, and useful in countering these practices. U.S. trade

policy cannot be effective without effective trade laws on the books as an avenue for securing relief.

INDUSTRIAL STRATEGY ACT

Whether one considers our Democratic task force on trade, the Harvard Business School project on industrial competitiveness, data resources study of the U.S. manufacturing sector, or the President's Commission on industrial competitiveness, study group after study group looking at the competitiveness of the U.S. industrial sector, all conclude that there is a serious problem with U.S. industrial competitiveness and make a recommendation that the United States develop some sort of industrial strategy for effective international competitiveness in the future.

This bill is meant to establish a framework for developing such a strategy and is similar to legislation which was reported from the House Banking and Energy and Commerce Committees during the last Congress. The major difference in this proposal is that it no longer contains authorization for a separate development bank as did last Congress, but rather relies on a much leaner financing mechanism, primarily utilizing loan guarantees and a secondary market, as a limited facilitator role for government financial involvement in implementation of an overall industrial strategy.

This bill would create an Economic Cooperation Council, broadly representative of government, business, labor, and others in society. It would work toward the development of a strategic consensus for our industrial economy and make recommendations regarding actions which might be taken by government, labor, and management to facilitate change and improve international competitiveness.

This bill would also create and Industrial Modernization and Financing Association and Secondary Market for Industrial Loans. These mechanisms are aimed at filling the gaps in the availability of capital for productive investment needed to revitalize our industrial sector and to finance the needs of innovative small and medium size businesses. Unlike the proposals discussed in the last Congress to create a National Industrial Development Bank, the Industrial Modernization and Financing Association and Secondary Market for Industrial Loans would be aimed at facilitating the flow of private capital to areas currently affected by structural impediments in our capital markets.

The Industrial Modernization and Financing Association would be an arm of the Economic Cooperation Council and could not undertake any activity which was inconsistent with a consensus based strategy for a given industrial sector. The association would utilize loan guarantees primarily

ly to conduct its businesses. The association's main purpose would be to assist in developing and implementing a package of commitments between management, labor, and the financial community to help modernize basic industries with serious competitive problems. The loan guarantee authority of the association would be the principal carrot available to the private sector to invest in modernizing existing industry and creating new production facilities.

The secondary market for industrial loans, similar to the secondary markets which exist for housing, would be aimed at providing long-term debt capital for purchase of plant and equipment for small to medium sized businesses. Regional and local banks are increasingly reluctant to take the risks associated with making long-term loans to small businesses.

Larger institutional investors, such as insurance companies and pension funds, are not equipped to evaluate the quality of smaller investment proposals and, therefore, tend to overlook them. A secondary market would address this problem by providing a mechanism to purchase loans to small and medium size industrial concerns from banks and then repackage them into pools of securities large enough and stable enough to be of interest to institutional investors.

Such a secondary market mechanism has worked well in the area of housing and can play a significant role in facilitating the growth and development of innovative small industrial firms.

The cost of establishing and carrying out the functions of these industrial strategy facilities is very modest considering the enormity of the task or the amount in previous proposals. The Economic Cooperation Council would be authorized to spend up to \$50 million for each fiscal year from 1986 through 1989. The secondary market for industrial loans would have a one time capitalization cost of \$100 million.

The Industrial Modernization and Financing Association would have a capital stock of \$1.5 billion. Two-thirds of this amount would be used as a reserve fund for any possible losses on guaranteed loans. No individual guarantee could exceed \$500 million. The other one-third of this fund could be used for direct lending by the association in accordance with the strategies developed by the Economic Cooperation Council.

PROJECT CHILD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes. ● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' atten-

tion to the innovative merits of a unique mental health program presently operating in the city of Providence, RI.

The program, Project CHILD [Children's Home-Based Intervention for Learning and Development], was created in 1981 by the Providence Center for Counseling and Psychiatric Services. Its primary objective is to address the cognitive and emotional needs of preschool children whose parents suffer from chronic mental illness. Throughout the years, this program has successfully sought out to break the cycle of dependence and illness which is literally passed on from generation to generation in such families.

Project CHILD's exceptional work in the mental health field was recently accorded high honors at the American Psychiatric Association's 36th Annual Institute on Hospital Community.

The APA is a medical specialty society representing over 30,000 psychiatrists nationwide. Chosen from among 134 applicants, Project CHILD received an award of significant achievement honoring its outstanding efforts on behalf of the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

Funded by the U.S. Department of Education and the Providence Center, Project CHILD targets preschool children because their parents often lead isolated lives. With limited exposure to people outside the family, these children often have no alternative but to model their own behavior on that of their parents.

Mr. Speaker, 70 percent of the children of psychotically ill parents exhibit adjustment problems by the time they reach adolescence. I am proud of Project CHILD for having finally broken that cycle.

Project CHILD's staff helps the children learn to become competent and self-reliant: First, having them complete concrete tasks in a structured environment; second, exposing these children to healthy, concerned adults; and third, by helping them to effectively separate from their parents so that they can establish their own identities.

I commend Project CHILD for its selection by the APA as an award winning program and invite my colleagues to view its successes as a model of what can be done for the at-risk emotionally ill of our Nation. ●

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I continue what I have on three previous occasions called My Advice to the Privileged Orders.

As I pointed out previously, I pay my respects to the great American poet, Joel Barlow, who was not only a poet and a great leader, but he was a minister, a preacher, if you please, to the American revolutionary armies. He had reason to write an extensive essay which he entitled, "My Advice to the Privileged Orders of Europe for a New Revolutionary International or Governmental System."

□ 1220

In other words, he was advocating revolution, very much like some of our neighbors to the south and other countries throughout the world since World War II.

I pointed out in the course of the last, No. 3, this I label my "Advice to the Privileged Orders of America," which, as I told my colleagues, I include the colleagues in the Congress because we are among the privileged, both in the sense that temporarily we are invested with this great power under our system of government of an attempt to try to be representative of those great people that have elected us to do so. And try to do so impartially, equally, without fear or favor, privileged to none. And yet in this day and time that becomes a real challenge.

I pointed out that also economically we are highly privileged. We are in the upper 10 percent of that apex of this pyramid of economic income in our country. I think that in itself, where our colleagues in the other body, over a third are in the range of millionaires, and now quite a substantial number of my colleagues in the House. I think that that means we have a real challenge for participatory democracy. But whether this has been the case or not, certainly it is time to address a plea to the privileged orders of our country today whose control today is all powerful, obliterative, and is really in control of our destiny—political, economic, and the like.

Any time we boast of a free participatory democracy and then point to the fact that the average campaign budget to get elected as a Member of the House of Representatives, not the Senate with a 6-year term, but the House with over half a million dollars, and where we now are accustomed to have million dollar budgets for some House seats, how in the world, with the added observation that the Presidential contest now involves millions and millions and millions of dollars, the first of which comes from those areas of concentrated wealth that today for the first time in the history of our Nation have gained complete control, the basic decisions, even as to war and peace, are not being made in these Halls, even though the Constitution says that war shall be decided only by the Congress, not delegatable; it cannot be delegated to the Execu-

tive. Yet we take for granted today the era of Presidential wars. We have a President that is involved in war now without the sanction of Congress, and who even defies the rather weak and somewhat pucillanious expressions that have emanated from Congress specifically with respect to Central America in which the Congress, both the Senate and the House, have spoken out as of last year in very definite and clear terms; they have said, "Mr. President, we have not declared war, so you stop making war. You shall not use congressionally disbursed funds or appropriated funds for aiding those that are in the course of attempting through violence to overthrow a regime that on the face of it we are at peace."

We accept this because we have an accepted envoy, an Ambassador, and when this happens, among civilized nations, it means that there is a recognition of that particular power.

But I also rise to continue what I said last time, and that is that not only have we gone full circle to that point, but the Founding Fathers, or at least the authors of the Constitution feared the most, we have ended up with two, well, one unelected President and two unelected Vice Presidents.

If this had ever been raised as a distant and impossibility during the debates of the Constitutional Convention, I seriously doubt the vote would have been found among the delegates to have created that second branch of the Government, article II, the executive branch. This they feared more than anything else. This is exactly why the power to declare war was placed exclusively in the Congress. The power to raise armies was placed in the Congress.

Yes, it is true, the Constitution also made the President Commander in Chief, naturally. Under this system of tripartite government there would be no other way out. But it was certainly limited, and it was clearly prescribed that the three branches were coequal, independent, and separate. No such thing as the superiority of one over the other. Each was restricted with well-defined powers.

Now when the Congress has delegated, as it did under necessity during World War I, great, great delegation of power, most of which has not been returned to the Congress under the Constitution, but which for good reason and cause of the exigencies of the moments were delegated. But today we live in a day and time in which the President defies the first branch of the Government. In this all-powerful consideration, even as of last week his defiance reached the point of violation of other laws that the Congress has passed.

Now, I have introduced a resolution in which I allege that the President is

in violation of the War Powers Limitation Act which we approved in 1974. I had a hand in its shaping. I had my doubts, but I always assumed that the Chief Executive would follow his oath of office under the Constitution, which is to faithfully execute the laws of the land. This he refuses to do, and quite arrogantly announced last week that what he was not empowered to do, and what the Congress had specifically prohibited him from doing, he was asking private, mostly rightwing extremist groups that have been the cause of the assassination of Archbishop and priests and nuns, the money coming from these groups, some based in Florida, some in other points in the country, and now having the blessings of the President to do by indirection, and asked publically to do so by the President, which I simply would be a violation of the Logan Act, if anything else. The Logan Act, which was so piously appealed to by the President and his cohorts seeking reelection last year, when Jesse Jackson was talking about going to some countries that this administration considers to be in a state of war, though not officially so, and interposed and said through a spokesman in the Justice Department. "Mr. Jackson, if you go and make that visit you might be imperiling your legal status inasmuch as you will be clearly in violation of the Logan Act."

□ 1230

I think that Jesse Jackson, under the explicit and clear terms of the Logan Act, would have been far less vulnerable in a court of jurisdiction than the President is today after his utterances last week.

Now, the bad part is that there are other and more important areas in which the Congress has, in my opinion, abdicated very serious responsibilities. In my appeal to the privileged orders, what I am saying simply is: You have the power but you do not have the accountability. The people did not elect you to run those nine most powerful banks that are jeopardizing the stability, not only of this country's financial conditions but the entire world.

I appeal to those privileged magnates which I prefer to use the term that Franklin Roosevelt used, malefactors of great wealth, because they have indeed, with the power they have acquired by indirection, and that they have not hesitated to use thoroughly, completely and graspingly and greedily. Please, at least have some, some residuum of accountability.

And I appeal to you the privileged in and out of this Chamber and particularly in those inner sanctums of the plush offices of these highly paid corporate lawyers who are in control, who are in effect writing the laws, who are in effect dictating the terms for any kind of a tax bill, the ones primarily

responsible for the first time in 1981 with what the President boasted and with great support with the cross-section of corporate power, the so-called economic recovery and reform tax. I never of any tax being called "economic recovery tax," but so be it; we live in that type of world. And in by virtue of that tax bill, gave away, drained the life blood of the revenues to our Treasury of over \$650 billion and then with great sanctimoniousness talks about a monster deficit, because it is due to the social programs such as food stamps.

David Rockefeller, in a big speech about 3 years ago said that was the reason why we were in trouble; food stamps. And he specifically mentioned that program.

Now, I think that anybody still in this Congress who voted for that 1981 tax, so-called tax legislation which for the first time in our country irretrievably abdicated the long time basic American system of taxation based on a progressive type of taxation, and which has resulted in such things as the biggest corporations in our country which are now not really tied to loyalty or fealty or nationality even though they may be based in this country, to this country.

They are now meganational institutions, transnational institutions. Where the profit goes, there is their allegiance; not necessarily the greatest interests of the greatest number of Americans.

And the result has been, yes, a deficit that this President said, when it was one-third the size it is now, was unacceptable. Today it is, but one thing that is not—and I think that here these privileged orders, these overlords of economic power who have sold out America with no accountability—not having to answer to any electorate; not having to have any kind of reckoning before any type of constituency other than their own balanced books and ledgers, but as always a history of mankind shows, when this group of humanity gets the power, it is insatiable.

And its greed leads ultimately to its own destruction. Unfortunately, in this day and time, in that misfortune are the ebbs and flows of the well-being or lack of a great populace such as America.

Also, about 100 years ago in England, which believe it or not was pretty much in a corresponding state of mind, the great John Ruskin, in a series of letters that he entitled, "Letters to the Workmen and Laborers of Great Britain."

The one he wrote, dated January 1, 1871, from Denmark Hill, says:

We begin today another group of 10 years not in happy circumstances, although for the time exempted from the direct calamities which have fallen on neighboring states, believe me, we have not escaped

them because of our better deserving, nor our better wisdom, but only for one of two bad reasons, or for both.

Either that we have not sense enough to determine in a great national quarrel which side is right, or that we have not courage to defend the right when we have discerned it.

I believe that both these bad reasons exist in full force, that our political divisions prevent us from understanding the laws of international justice and that ever if we did, we should not have to defend perhaps not even to assert them, being on the 1st of January 1871, in much bodily fear—that is to say, afraid of the Russians, afraid of the Prussians, afraid of the Americans, afraid of the Hindus, afraid of the Chinese, afraid of the Japanese, afraid of the New Zealanders, and afraid of the Kafiris, and very justly so.

Being conscious that our only real desire respecting any of these nations has been to get as much out of them as we could.

What better and more eloquent description of our state of mind: We fear the Russians, we fear the Latin Americans, we fear the Chinese, we fear the Middle Europe, and we are just fearful, all the way around.

But now my special appeal this day to the privileged orders is a two-phased appeal. First to my colleagues and also second to these privileged orders that have brought us to the past where we cannot much longer temporize with the inevitable, and that is to face the consequences of what has been boasted as a recovery.

I have pointed out previously that America has lost control of its destiny with respect to its economic, meaning fiscal, monetary, well-being. I have pointed out and have alluded to the greatest leaders our country has had in its successive history at the height of crises, in which the essential issue is the same: Who is going to gain and exercise the power of the allocation of credit? The bankers, or the people, as it is intended it should be? Both through their election of their representatives in the Congress as well as theirs in the executive branch—the President and Vice President.

I have pointed out for years that there was no accountability from such an entity as the Federal Reserve Board which, in the meanwhile, had arrogated some and been given by the Congress in other instances, though not debated.

For example, if you pull out a dollar bill from your pocket, you will see "Federal Reserve Note." When I came to Congress, and that is some 24 years ago, and for a few years thereafter, there were more one dollar bills that said "Treasury notes."

Now you, what's the difference? Big difference. But that became possible because there was an obscure amendment that was placed in the law, without debate, that made it possible to reconstruct the fundamental charter known as the Federal Reserve Board Act of 1913.

□ 1240

When Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board such as I have seen in these 24 years—and, let's see, there will be a total of some five or six—and with the exception of perhaps two who did not occupy the office for long, every one appearing before the Committee on Banking, of which I have been a member since I came here, have refused to even give an accounting of the basic decisionmaking processes and, rather, have had such haughty and arrogant Chairmen as those who appeared and, in direct answer to a question I propounded, said, "Oh, yes, of course, some Americans will have to suffer a decline in their standard of living."

"Well, who are those?" I said, "Mr. Chairman, are those most of the people I represent? I think they are. Certainly you cannot tell me it will be David Rockefeller and those levels of families. They are not going to suffer any decline in their standard of living. Who are you talking about?"

And he said, "Well, we hope that whoever it is—and, yes, you may be right, the people you are talking about may be the ones, but it will be temporary."

Now, since when was it ever intended that a powerful mogul, a panjandrum of power, who does not have to run for election, does not even feel he has to account either to the Congress or the President and has reached the point that he accounts only to those sources from which he comes, he comes off the payroll of the Chase Manhattan, and that is where he will go back the moment he stops his service as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, very much like the former Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger.

He left being Secretary. He is still a special consultant to the Chase Manhattan, got a good fat income. On top of that, he has organized a private enterprise State Department. Why, there are more foreign diplomats making a beeline for Henry Kissinger's consultant's office than there are to old George Shultz as Secretary of State. Who knows about it or who cares?

Yet these men have been unaccountable. They have been given power, yes, in the case of Mr. Kissinger, by a President who delegated Presidential power and authority. In fact, I think we had the first Prime Minister in the history of our country, the way we were operating there for a while.

But in the case of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, it is not his to say what the policies of national note and construction shall be that will determine the well-being or the standard of living. That is in the policymaking body that the people elect us to Congress, the lawmaking body.

But why this? Because the way now it is operating, of course the Federal

Reserve Board is not a Federal agency. It is an independent private enterprise run by the six principal largest banks in our country who in turn have been such rotten bankers that they have laid in bad loans to the so-called developing world alone—I am not including Poland, where they also have millions—but I am talking about in the developing countries alone, which anybody with any kind of reasoning and basic information and not totally blinded by greed of collecting 30 percent and 35 percent interest have invested an overhang of such magnitude that it is 200 percent the basic assets of these banks.

Now, if that were a bank back home, it would have already been declared illiquid, bankrupt. But what are the concomitants of that? I listened a few moments ago to my distinguished colleague who serves on the same committee as I do, and he mentioned the reintroduction of a bill that is intended to try to reverse what is now catastrophe, and that is our international trade and accounts imbalance, which is monstrous and the real, real problem, and yet there is nobody addressing it.

My colleague feels that there is something that can be done that would enable our corporations to compete in the world. But let us look at the facts. The facts are that under this administration and for the past 4 years we have emerged from a creditor nation to a debtor nation.

Now, there are some economists, the same ones who were telling us 10 years ago that domestic deficits were intolerable and the direct cause for high interest rates, who now say, in the light of the most monstrous deficit that, no, there is no relationship, high interest rates are due to something else, maybe an act of God.

These same self-economists will say, "Well, you know, being a debtor nation does not mean much because most of our national existence we were a debtor nation."

I cannot conceive of a more facetious expression from men who are supposed to be experts in economics than that.

Of course it was not until World War I, which, incidentally, as I have said, we were the only creditor nation; same thing true in World War II, we were the only creditor nation.

As a matter of fact, neither World War I nor World War II would have lasted 4 months without loss to the German imperial armies or Hitler's Wehrmacht had it not been for American credit. And the sorry history of what happened after World War I is being repeated in what we confront today after World War II, and when some of us try to evoke this history so that we could avoid these pitfalls, we

were considered way out—in fact, maybe something peculiar with us.

So let us look at the facts. Let us see what any American corporation can do to try to regain even a competitive leverage.

As a result of this sellout on the part of our public, or what I call private money managers, in total control of our financial destiny, and the private, item 1: French, German exports to the United States in 1984 rose over 33 percent; Japan, Korea, Taiwan even faster than that. Brazil, which was one of those nations which has been able to rollover only interest payments, has not hit the principal yet to these big banks—and that we had to go in and loan a couple of billion dollars, or give, in order that they could rollover those payments so that they could pay the banks, not for U.S. interest, unless we consider that the banks are one and the same as the United States.

As the chairman of the board of General Motors once said, "What is good for General Motors is good for the country." Brazil's last year's surplus in trade balance amounted to \$12 billion while ours went up to the most unheard-of in the history of human activity to over \$133 billion. And as I pointed out, for each one of those \$10 billion, America has lost 250,000 jobs permanently, which is what my distinguished colleague a while ago was referring to. But we cannot attack the problem and have a solution that is correct unless we understand the cause and do not flail before the magnitude of the task.

What we are seeing now is, we are paying, after the election of last year, the price tag for past mistakes. We have no policy—that is, no overarching policy. All we have are ad hoc responses to the crises as they come up.

In September 1982, Mexico said, calling at midnight the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board "Well, look, fellows, we are sorry, we cannot even pay interest; if you do not give us a moratorium, why, we may have to default."

□ 1250

Of course, that brought a midnight session, and immediately the next day, there was \$4 billion provided Mexico, some in direct exchange aid, and others in direct credit aid, and others in so-called purchases of oil in which the purchase per barrel price has not even been revealed publicly to this date. In other words, it was a way of bailing out Mexico so that the banks would not go broke in America.

It is still shaky; nothing has been addressed. There has not been \$100 paid on the principal. They have just been rolling over interest. More debt to try and get rid of debt.

Now, as of June last year, item 1: "These American corporations went into the Eurodollar market for about

\$18 billion-plus as of June." If they were going at the rate of \$18 billion as of June, when the final figures for December 1984 are compiled, I will say it will be at least 300 percent more. Even this \$18 billion borrowing was 13 times the volume of 6 years ago.

Item 2: Pension funds. Oh, these are sacrosanct. Those of us who are worried about housing Americans, taking care of our own people first, trying to avoid a coming social crisis because of the lack of adequate housing and shelter, seeing with great chagrin and sadness the homeless that now are over 2 million Americans. Not aimless drifters but families. Look at this and say, well, why can we not tap these vast reservoirs of over \$85 billion, \$90 billion worth of pensions? Oh, no, you cannot do that because there is no way you can invest that in long-term mortgages. But, pension funds, well, 5 years ago, only 8 percent of America's 1,600 largest pension funds invested in foreign securities. At the end of 1984, 28 percent were doing so.

Item 3: Funds from overseas financed over 40 percent of our budget deficit. That is, we have become victims and at the mercy of fickle foreign investors. They now are providing the finances for over 40 percent of our budget deficit. That is our domestic budget deficit.

Item 4: Mitsubishi Bank acquired Bancal Tristate of California. Assets: \$3.9 billion. When I tried to get the Federal Reserve Board to give me statistics as to the acquisition of banks by foreign interests in 1977, 1978, and 1979, they said they could not do it. I was warning then, not now, every time I have spoken here this year in this session—I can make reference page and word and line to the RECORD, some of it going back over 20 years ago.

Item 5: Five of Japan's biggest steel-makers spent over \$500 million last year to buy into America's counterparts.

Item 6: France's Societe Generale was financing the water system of Dayton, OH. Why? I thought this is why we had a banking system. I thought that when a bank was chartered, it was supposed to be chartered only for public need and convenience. Why are those resources not available for Dayton, OH, instead of those banking resources being tied up by our billionaire potentates like Hunt of Texas trying to tie up and corner the silver market and tying up over \$35 billion worth of bank resources. Exxon taking over this, that, and the other from another corporation; giant eating up giant and involving and tying up billions and billions of banking resources that are supposed to be for the purpose of firing the engines of industry and production in America, because Americans have lost the power to determine who allocates credit and for what purpose.

Item 7: Japan's Sumitomo Bank was a guarantor of bonds for the University of Virginia. The internationalization of capital has become endemic under this administration. From 1981 to the present, we have been converted from a producing nation to the dumping ground of the world.

In those same years, we have become not a creditor, but a debtor nation. Of course it has awesome significance, for it means that we are, as I say and repeat, at the mercy of fickle foreign interests. Some of whom are former conquered enemies. Are we so naive and gullible as to think that a conquered people think they are anything else? Are we so gullible and so childish as to believe for one-half second that they will be thinking of the national interests of the United States or their own and to try and emerge from their submission as conquered nations?

History shows that anyone that believes that believes anything, including the tooth fairy. These megacorporations, under this administration, have spread their operations in tremendously new ways. As I pointed out, and I have just skimmed the surface today on these items, I intend as we go along to pursue on a specific, as they used to say during the impeachment uproar, "specificity." Because I have also reintroduced my resolution of impeachment of Chairman Volcker. I have also, in past sessions, specified specific acts that anybody in that Constitutional Convention in the 1780's, in grasping for the words in which they would draft that section in the Constitution providing for the impeachment of Federal officials, would clearly say that is the reason they put it in the Constitution. That is, so there could be a reach to a public official or quasi-public official who might have arrogated, directly or indirectly, tremendous powers without accountability. Impeachment is the answer.

Nobody is exempted. Now, Mr. Volcker might think that, since he and the practices do not consider them Federal officials. I have news for them: Under the precedents that I have studied and have researched quite vigorously, Mr. Volcker would be very much amenable.

Now, I know that sounds bombastic, and I know that is the way it sounded when I first introduced the measure, but some day, and perhaps it will be too late by then, there will be a fuller realization, and perhaps a far more sympathetic understanding as to the reasons why I would be motivated. I have never in my legislative history—and I might remind my colleagues that I have served 3 years on the local legislative body known as a city council in the city of San Antonio, and 5 years privileged to represent the 26th senatorial district in the Texas State Senate, and 24 years here—and never

once, even my worst detractors cannot point to one line in which I have acted either with levity or with any kind of an emotional purpose in mind to arouse passions unnecessarily or to arouse anger and resentment against some other individual.

□ 1300

My actions have been dictated and motivated only after very careful and long-time research. I might remind my colleagues that I had the same reaction when I introduced for the first time in the history of the Congress a resolution not to investigate, as it was later distorted—and I might remind my colleagues that I have reference to the so-called ad hoc committee or the Select Committee on Assassinations. My intention was that the Congress had a responsibility. It has always exerted it in the whole course of the history of the Congress, since the first one in 1789.

In fact, at the height of the Civil War, when some of my colleagues got nervous about 5 years ago when I introduced a resolution informally suggesting that the Congress review the conduct of the Vietnam war. Well, at the height of the Civil War, this House of Representatives had a select committee doing exactly that, reviewing the conduct of the war, and nobody thought that it was untoward or divisive. It was a responsibility, since the Congress is the one, under the Constitution, to raise and provide for the armies, the raising of armies.

When I introduced a resolution in 1975, on February 14, it was thought ridiculous. It was misinterpreted. It was said that I intended to have an investigation as to the murder of John Kennedy, not realizing that my phraseology said "beginning with the assassination of John Kennedy and the assassination of Robert Kennedy, and the assassination of Martin Luther King, and the attempted assassination of the Governor of Alabama at the time, who was running for the Presidency."

Why did I phrase it that way? Because I felt that after 10 years of violence that had impacted our democratic processes, the Congress had an inescapable obligation to review and, if possible, seek some kind of a legislative approach or handle to try to diminish this awful thing of government by the bullet rather than by the ballot. But the thing, when it ended up, was another resolution, and then it became a sort of a whodunit type of thing, which I always felt was beyond the prerogatives of the Congress. It did not stipulate a legislative purpose I thought I had in mind.

I know that when I introduced that resolution, the first one of its kind, I was kind of ridiculed. But less than 7 months after its introduction, I had over 50 colleagues saying, "Hey, we

heard from some constituent. We want to know what this is all about." I had invitations from Berlin newspapers, magazines, and even TV stations, Paris, France, Tokyo, Japan, because they thought, they understood, that I was seeking an assassination investigation of John F. Kennedy, where in Europe and in other places there had and continues to be a great deal of question. I said, "You have misinterpreted. It is not true. I cannot conduct an investigation. I have merely introduced a resolution."

Well, lo and behold, because of other conjunctions of events, as has always happened in my career, it becomes alive and kicking 2 weeks before the termination of that Congress in September. Then, of course, the rest is history, and it was not at all pleasant. It was one of the greatest crises I have beheld and confronted in my career, and it meant antagonizing the leaders of this body, my own party leaders, and then antagonizing others, but the basic reason was that I realized that as a Member of the House, and designated to be chairman in the beginning of the Congress in 1977, either I was a name or I was only a symbol because of a contentious, rather famous attorney who had been selected by my predecessor unilaterally to serve as chief counsel. I had to make that decision, and I made it. I am not so enamored of the position of chairmanship of anything. I did not run for the office of chairmanship or anything else. I ran for the position of the Representative of the 20th Congressional District of the State of Texas, and I came up here to partake in the legislative process, and that is it. And that is exactly what I do when I rise and I make these appeals, because time is awasting. It may be perhaps too late for some of the suggestions that I have presented to this Congress, some going back as long ago as 18 years ago, some further than that, 19 years ago, some 20 years ago, all having to do with what I claim is a recapturing for the American people their destiny of economic well being and freedom.

The American people are not economically free. We may have relative political freedom, but we do not economic. And sacrificed on the altars of greed have been what we call and have taken pride in designating as the American standard of living, the American way. I feel that just the specific items that I have brought out today will require some elaboration and some addition. There are other areas, because it is interconnected.

High interest rates are at the root cause, but why high interest rates? What causes it? What is the real reason? To hear some of these great financial leaders that have come before the committee, one would think high interest rates are an act of God, it is like a flood, it is like some uncontrollable

natural event, but of course, it is manmade and, therefore, susceptible of manmade solution. The real basic reason is that once a people lose control to the most powerfully selfish interest of self-aggrandizement, who worship at the altars of aggrandizement and unconscionable profit would not hesitate 1 minute to exact almost what I call extortionate, indeed they are, in fact, extortionate rates of interest which are flagellating the American people. There is not a businessman I know back home or anywhere else, and I mean small businessmen, really small, who if he needs credit with the local bank can get a small loan, say \$1,000 or \$1,500, which to those businessmen is not small, it is substantial, at a lesser rate of interest than about 14 or 15 percent, and there is no way, no way, no way, no society, no people, no nation in the whole written history of the annals of mankind where you had that exaction that has been able to endure economically free. If we do not have economic freedom in the type of structured society that predominates the world today, what do we have?

□ 1310

I say that with that and the concomitant policies, why do we have the type of policy that results in what I started today's remarks with in Central and Latin America generally? The root causes again go back to this: In some circles in Latin America our troops are looked upon as the banks' collectors.

We talk about people who have suffered invasions. My grandfather led the North Mexican forces against the French invaders of Maximilian. Why were the French troops, the pride and glory of Napoleon III, in Mexico? They were exactly for that reason. They were trying to collect debts the Mexican Government and people were accused of reneging payment on.

We do not look upon ourselves that way, but that again gives rise to why I make my appeal to the privileged orders, those who have the true power of decision. Certainly nobody would say they reside in an individual, solitary Member of a 435-Member body. Certainly not. But our system is predicated on that one voice and that one vote being cast as a direct agent of the most direct kind ever devised in any country in immediate contact with the people who have chosen him or her to be their agent.

This is why there are the differences. You can be appointed a Member of the other body; of this one you cannot. The only way any one of us can get here is to be elected by the people back in that district. We cannot be appointed. There is a reason for that, and the reason is that this office is destined, construed, shaped, and structured to be in as direct and immediate

diate contact with the people as possible.

This is why they had the debate as to whether the terms of office of a Member of the House should be 2 or 3 years. That was the biggest debate, and the 3-year motion lost by one vote in the Constitutional Convention. But the reason was that they wanted this office to be a prime constitutional office, as directly accessible to the people as any human office could be designed to be. And when we become so distant that perhaps a Representative has to have a representative, then I think we are in bad straits, and when we compound the accretion of neglect and abdication of at least three decades, the past seems impossible.

But there is one saving grace, and that is the American people themselves. The American people themselves, as I witness it, are there, and they are smart enough and wise enough to know how to discern an issue if the issue is presented, if they are informed, if they have an understanding of the true nature of the issue involved. If not, we cannot blame the American people. But otherwise, in my opinion, that is the saving sap in this American tree of democracy or representative participatory democracy.

That is where I pitch my faith, and I wish I could share with my colleagues, as disparate as my words may sound to your ears, the number of telephone calls received from every single State of the Union. I never address an audience outside the confines of this body. I have been using this forum because this is what I have—one voice, one vote, and I make use of them. I have been using this forum since the second week after I was sworn into the House of Representatives, and not only since the proceedings have been covered by television.

Nevertheless, I wish I could share the response. Certainly these Americans have no direct connection with the 20th Congressional District of Texas, but it must be they are thinking of these issues and it must be that they are hearing something they are not accustomed to hearing during debate.

As I pointed out last week, it seems to me almost an act of negligence to discuss a \$315 billion defense budget, which in my opinion is really a war budget, and based on an assumption that the world is the same as it was in 1946, with no mention of the fact that there has been no final treaty or resolution of World War II, without examining the predicate of the basis of this defense request in light of a completely changed and wholly new world.

I see a resurrection of policies that were bankrupt then, and certainly now. In 1929 we had the "gunboat diplomacy," now resurrected by our President whose mind-set seems to be

1946 with respect to Europe and 1929 with respect to Latin America generally. I say to my colleagues this is a disastrous error or profound significance. Even though we may have voted certain directional imperatives to the President, he is determined and at this present moment is surrounding Nicaragua with over 30,000 of our men in the air, on land, and on the sea.

On these exercises, now known as Pine Tree, I have dire feelings about the men, ranging all the way from those that have been allowed to go in to others like National Guard components. I noticed the Governor of California refused to let his National Guard go, and he is a Republican Party Governor, whereas my State's Governor, the Governor of Texas, allowed his National Guard to go. And we heard one of the most tragic utterances by one of the commanders, saying, "Well, the reason we want to get these men in particular from southwest Texas is that they are people that might understand the language of the people we are going over to in Honduras."

On examination, this is terrible. Why do we do it in the case of the so-called Hispanic? And that is a word I do not really like either, because I am really a Mexican-American. I do not really like the hyphenated word, either. I have always fought those who would have us use hyphenated Americanisms. I have always said that we are either Americans or we are not, and if I am not, I want to know who I am.

But I think it is terrible. We do not say that we are going to send troops to Germany, but we are going to try to select German-descended Americans who speak the language. We do not say that we are going to get members from our American society of the Jewish faith to send them over to the Middle East, or, for that matter, of Arabic descent. We do not say, "Well, we are going to send only Asiatic-descended members of our society to go and be one of the 45,000 troops we have in Korea." Yet this is being said and done right now in my backyard.

So I think that all of these are interconnecting developments. If we look at what we have lost, even with our next adjacent country, directly because of the miscalculated financial and economic judgments of our leaders in this country, we see that all of a sudden our balance of trade, which was the most favorable of all the countries we were trading with, with Mexico, is reversed, and we end up with over 20 percent unemployed up and down the border.

Now, I ask, what clearer evidence do we have of bankrupt policies than those? If we do not address the cause, we cannot hope to find a happy solution. And, of course, there are solutions. There is no good reason why we

should consider following this course that is irreversibly set by this President, which, as I have said time after time, is pitting your children and my children and our grandchildren and great-grandchildren, yours and mine, in eternal enmity with the very neighbors we must share the New World with. It is inexorable, and there is no need for that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

□ 1320

A PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] for his concern about America, for his interest in expressing his concern and for his expertise in bringing them before the House in such an eloquent manner.

Mr. Speaker, just about any time we converse or gather in these times, it doesn't take very long for us to begin discussing the problems of America—problems such as agriculture; the social problems of our people, towns, and cities; the deterioration of the infrastructure of America; the national debt; the necessity of defense and the cost of it; our educational institutions; and the continued deterioration of the moral fiber of America.

I'm going to touch on a concern which I have that is growing daily, but first, I want to comment on "what's right about America." Too often, we get so wrapped up in obstacles and problems and fears about the prospects for the future that we lose sight of what we really have.

I'm proud to be an American and we can be grateful for the heritage which our forefathers left us, especially in our Nation's Capital where I, along with millions of others, feel a sense of pride every time I see the magnificent dome of the Capitol Building, or whenever I see the Jefferson, Lincoln, and Washington memorials and review the philosophy and the achievements in the history of those great leaders.

I recently went to Arlington Cemetery, with 325 school patrol students from Columbus, GA, and participated in laying a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. I was struck by the inscription on the tomb, "Here lies an American soldier, known but to God."

As I looked around at the thousands of white crosses and monuments of America's hallowed dead, who had given the utmost, their very lives, on behalf of all of us and our freedom, I was filled with a sense of pride and

peacefulness and I thanked God for this country and its principles.

You know we have the freedom to say what we think, to condemn the Government, without fear of being hauled away in the middle of the night to prison as happens in many countries, to workshop as we please, to enter into the free enterprise system, and to succeed or to fail.

We can vote into or out of office representatives of government without fear of reprisal, and we only have to watch the evening news to realize it's not that way in many areas of the world.

The last paragraph of the unanimous Declaration of Independence of the 13 States of America signed on July 4, 1776, summed up—I might add at great risk and courage—the foundation of America as follows:

As free and independent States they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do.

Mr. Speaker, there are many countries in this world who have lost these rights, and we have to as citizens of this great Nation remember that ours did not come to our forefathers without risk and must never be taken for granted.

Now I want to touch on an area of growing concern to me—the long-term dangers of the agricultural crisis which we face in America today, including the demise of our textile industry.

One of the most serious problems facing America in my opinion is the deep seated and mostly unrecognized danger involving our agriculture.

The immediate and short range problems are desperate and must be dealt with in order to save those farmers who can survive with assistance and time.

I am informed that we have three tiers of farmers, among less than 2 percent of our Nation today, and of those only 600,000 produce all of the food and natural fibers which our Nation consumes and exports.

The first of these three tiers is a group of farmers who are so deeply in debt that it is practically impossible for them to survive.

The second tier can survive, with cooperation from their financial sources and with favorable growing and marketing conditions over a few years.

The third tier, which is probably in the minority, has managed to remain financially solvent.

As we look toward the turn of the century, we can expect some rather disturbing events to take place in my opinion.

Of the 600,000 farmers producing food, the average age is 50 years.

We can expect their expertise to be sharply reduced in the next 15 years, as new generations shun a farming or agricultural career.

Therefore, it is likely that we will face a period in which the pipelines from farm to market will dry up and the food surpluses, which America is famous for, will disappear.

Should this occur, we would look to foreign sources for food and fiber, and I would imagine that the energy crisis of the 1970's would be somewhat mild compared to the panic that would occur in America, if our food supplies began to be limited.

Much of our textile fiber is used totally or in blended fashion, and of course is produced by agriculture.

I was astounded a few weeks ago when General Sennawald, commander of all the Army in the continental United States, testified before the Armed Services Committee, on which I sit, that there is not a single textile manufacturer in the United States who has the expertise to manufacture clothing to protect our soldiers from chemical warfare.

It is all imported from Great Britain.

As a result, I have been raising the question of the effect that a declining American agriculture and textile industry will have on our national security and I was further astounded to learn that it probably doesn't rank near the top areas of concern regarding national security at the present time.

I have brought together a committee of varied and specialized farmers and agribusiness people from the third district to channel their concerns, ideas, suggestions, and requests to me, in order that I can better represent agriculture in a more coordinated manner in the Congress.

Recently, in a meeting in Reynolds, GA, 19 members of this committee joined me in writing the President, expressing our concern and urging that he give consideration to convening a commission, such as the Greenspan Commission which saved Social Security.

The administration has expressed interest in this proposal, and I am presently working with Members of Congress to gather a list of about 60 qualified farmers, agricultural specialists, educational people, economists, and marketing and agribusiness people to present to the White House as potential candidates to discuss this idea further.

To encourage the President, I am planning to introduce a sense of the Congress resolution, urging him to convene this commission.

My concern is that 15 years down the road, our industry will have changed completely, or will be almost gone. Trade is a delicate situation and our country is involved in a great deal of agricultural trade for reasons that aren't strictly economic.

But, there is a tremendous danger for this country if we allow ourselves

to begin importing more and more of our food and fiber. There is a fine line between foreign diplomacy and foreign dependency, and I don't want to see our country cross that line.

I used to be a farmer, but I don't consider myself an agricultural expert. So, I haven't tried to tell the President or the proposed commission what they should do or how they should do it. But, common sense tells me that the best way to handle this problem is to let the experts look at it. If this agricultural commission is formed, then the experts from all branches of farming will have a chance to work on a solution.

I will be introducing this legislation within a couple of weeks. I believe this is an idea that may be able to help us focus our agricultural efforts in this country and I hope my colleagues who share my concern in this area will join me in introducing this resolution.

THE SPACE HARVEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Friday I had the privilege to preside as master of ceremonies at the annual Goddard Memorial Dinner in Washington, DC.

Each year the National Space Club honors an individual or individuals with its top award, the Goddard Memorial Trophy. President Reagan is the recipient for 1985 because of his leadership in America's space program by calling for the creation of a manned space station.

As master of ceremonies, I shared that I never cease to be amazed at the tremendous space achievements that we have made in recent years. Indeed, we have landed men on the Moon, landed spacecraft on Mars, returned pictures from Jupiter, and received signals from a Pioneer spacecraft as it left our solar system.

In addition to these technical achievements, I am impressed by the growing and tremendous potential offered by space commercialization ventures, especially those in the areas of developing and producing new materials and drugs.

I strongly support the innovative and visionary efforts by NASA and firms like 3M, McDonnell Douglas, Johnson & Johnson, Microgravity Research Associates, and others to explore and exploit the potential for space manufacturing.

Additionally, it is clear to me that achieving a fully operational space shuttle system and developing a permanently manned space station will be vital to the ultimate success of these space commercialization ventures.

Also, I believe that the establishment of NASA's Office of Space Commercialization will be truly beneficial to achieving the visionary aspirations that those in Government and industry have for space commercialization ventures.

Finally, I applaud the action taken by the President today to establish the National Commission on Space as mandated in last year's NASA authorization bill. This Commission should prove invaluable in helping us formulate our national space goals for the years ahead.

We are at the dawn of a new era—the decisions that Government and industry make over the next few years that will determine the extent by which the Nation as a whole benefits from the potentials offered by the new frontier of space.

The benefits of our decades of investment in space are there for the asking if we as a nation reach out to grasp them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LUNGREN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUNGREN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ECKART of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUNDINE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RAY, for 30 minutes, April 2.

Mr. DASCHLE, for 60 minutes, April 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUNGREN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ECKART of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.
Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.
Mrs. LLOYD in five instances.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.
Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
Mr. PENNY.
Mrs. BOXER.
Mr. FRANK in three instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. DYMALLY.
Mr. LaFALCE.
Mr. WISE.

SENATE BILL, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 781. An act to amend the Biomass Energy and Alcohol Fuels Act of 1980 to clarify the intention of section 221 of the Act; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

S.J. Res. 15. Joint resolution to designate May 7, 1985, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution designating March 1985 as "National Mental Retardation Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 21 through April 28, 1985, as "Jewish Heritage Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution designating 1985 as the "year of Social Security"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 28. Joint Resolution to designate the week of September 8 through September 14, 1985, as "National Independent Retail Grocer Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 29. Joint Resolution to designate the week of November 11, 1985, through November 17, 1985, as "National Reye's Syndrome Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 31. Joint Resolution to designate the week of November 24 through November 30, 1985, as "National Family Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint Resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 21 through April 27, 1985, as "National Organ Donation Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 48. Joint Resolution to designate the year of 1986 as the "Year of the Teacher"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 50. Joint Resolution to designate the week of April 1, 1985, through April 7, 1985, as "World Health Week", and to designate April 7, 1985, as "World Health Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 53. Joint Resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the

month of June 1985 as "Youth Suicide Prevention Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 58. Joint Resolution to designate the week of April 21, 1985, through April 27, 1985, as "National Drug Abuse Education and Prevention Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 60. Joint Resolution to designate the week of May 12, 1985, through May 18, 1985, as "Senior Center Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 61. Joint Resolution to designate the week of May 1, 1985, through May 7, 1985, as "National Osteoporosis Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of U.S. weather satellites; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution designating the month of November 1985 as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1985, as "National Agriculture Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to designate October 16, 1985, as "World Food Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to designate April 1985, as "Fair Housing Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the month of May 1985, as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Medicare be commended on its 20th anniversary for the program's success in protecting older Americans against the high cost of health care; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to designate the month of April 1985 as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month";

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate the week of March 10 through 16, 1985, as "National Employ-the-Elder-Worker Week";

H.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution designating March 22, 1985, as "National Energy Education Day"; and

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 29, 1985, present to the President, for his

approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1984, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85-804

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, March 22, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In compliance with Section 4(a) of Public Law 85-804, enclosed is the calendar year 1984 report on *Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense*.

Section A, Department of Defense Summary, shows that 51 contractual actions were approved and that 12 were disapproved. Included in the number approved are 50 actions for which the Government's liability is contingent and cannot be estimated.

Section B presents those actions which were submitted by the Navy and Air Force with an estimated or potential cost of \$50,000 or more. A list of contingent liability claims is also included. The Army and Defense Logistics Agency reports indicated that no actions of \$50,000 or more were approved; and the Defense Nuclear Agency reported no actions.

One contract has been omitted pursuant to Section 4(a) of the Act.

Sincerely,
D.O. COOKE,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, JANUARY-DECEMBER, 1984

SECTION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SUMMARY

Department and type of action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount
Department of Defense—Total.....	51	0	0	12	\$29,230,125
Amendments without consideration.....	11	0	0	9	11,256,800
Correction of mistakes.....	0	0	0	3	17,973,325
Contingent liabilities.....	50	0	0	0	0
Army—Total.....	0	0	0	3	17,926,192
Amendments without consideration.....	0	0	0	1	1,098
Correction of mistakes.....	0	0	0	2	17,925,094
Navy—Total.....	40	0	0	5	699,337

Department and type of action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount
Amendments without consideration.....	11	0	0	4	621,106
Correction of mistakes.....	0	0	0	1	48,231
Contingent liabilities.....	39	0	0	0	0
Air Force—Total.....	1	0	0	3	4,745,170
Amendments without consideration.....	0	0	0	3	4,745,170
Contingent liabilities.....	11	0	0	0	0
DIA—Total.....	0	0	0	1	5,899,426
Amendments without consideration.....	0	0	0	1	5,899,426
DNA—Total.....	0	0	0	0	0

¹ This is an action not involving specific dollar costs.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS WITH ACTUAL OR POTENTIAL COST OF \$50,000 OR MORE TAKEN PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 85-804 TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE, JANUARY-DECEMBER 1984

SECTION B—DEPARTMENT SUMMARY

U.S. ARMY

Type of action and contractor	Amount requested	Approved
The report of extraordinary contractual actions from the U.S. Army indicated that no actions of \$50,000 or more were approved.		

U.S. NAVY

CONTINGENT LIABILITIES

Provisions to indemnify contractors against liabilities because of claims for death, injury, or property damage arising from nuclear radiation, use of high energy propellants, or other risks not covered by the contractor's insurance program were included in 39 contracts (the potential cost of the liabilities cannot be estimated inasmuch as the liability to the Government, if any, will depend upon the occurrence of an incident as described, in the indemnification clause). Items procured are generally those associated with nuclear-powered vessels, nuclear armed guided missiles, experimental work with nuclear energy, handling of explosives, or performance in hazardous areas.

Contractor	Number of Contracts
General Dynamics Corp.....	21
General Electric Co.....	4
Honeywell, Inc.....	1
Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.....	3
Raytheon Co.....	1
Rockwell International Co.....	2
The Singer Corp.....	1
Vitro Corp.....	2
Westinghouse Electric Corp.....	4
Total.....	39

U.S. AIR FORCE

CONTINGENT LIABILITIES

Provisions to indemnify contractors against liabilities because of claims for death, injury, or property damage arising from nuclear radiation, use of high energy propellants, or other risks not covered by the contractor's insurance program were included in 11 contracts (the potential cost of the liabilities cannot be estimated inasmuch as the liability to the Government, if any, will depend upon the occurrence of an incident as described, in the indemnification

clause). Items procured are generally those associated with nuclear-powered vessels, nuclear armed guided missiles, experimental work with nuclear energy, handling of explosives, or performance in hazardous areas.

Contractor	Number of Contracts
Aerojet Strategic Propulsion Co.....	1
Boeing Co.....	2
General Electric Co.....	1
Honeywell, Inc.....	1
Martin Marietta Corp.....	2
Morton Thiokol, Inc.....	1
Northrop Corp.....	1
TRW, Inc.....	2
Total.....	11

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Type of action and contractor	Amount requested	Approved
The report of extraordinary contractual actions from the Defense Logistics Agency indicated that no actions of \$50,000 or more were approved.		

DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY

Type of action and contractor	Amount requested	Approved
No extraordinary contractual actions were reported for 1984 by the Defense Nuclear Agency.		

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

917. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of a proposed letter of offer to Thailand for defense articles estimated to cost \$50 million or more (Transmittal No. 85-20), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

918. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Shipbuilding and Logistics), transmitting notification that the study of the T-2 aircraft maintenance functions at Beville and Kingsville, TX, and Meridan, MS, have shown contractor performance to be cost effective, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 nt (Public Law 96-342, section 502(b) (96 Stat. 747)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

919. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, pursuant to Public Law 85-804, section 4; to the Committee on Armed Services.

920. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the 1984 annual report of the Financial Institutions Examination Council; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

921. A letter from the Presiding Officer, Advisory Council on Education Statistics, Department of Education, transmitting the annual report for 1984 of the National Center for Education Statistics, pursuant to GEPA, section 406(d)(1) (88 Stat. 556); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

922. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Toxic Substances

Control Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

923. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting, a notice of intent to approve certain commercial technical assistance or manufacturing licensing agreements in non-NATO countries, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

924. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Air Force's proposed letter of offer to Thailand for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 85-20), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

925. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report on political contributions by Donald S. Lowitz, to be the U.S. representative to the Conference on Disarmament with rank of Ambassador, pursuant to Public Law 96-465, section 304(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

926. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a copy of the original report of political contributions for George Southhall Vest, of Virginia, to be the Director General of the Foreign Service and Director of Personnel, pursuant to Public Law 96-465, section 304(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

927. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the Senate Building Beauty Shop financial statements for fiscal years ending February 29, 1984, and February 28, 1983 (GAO-AFMD-85-37), pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 193m-1; to the Committee on Government Operations.

928. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, transmitting a report of a new system of records entitled the "Secretary Access Control System Records, STATE-54," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

929. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting an evaluation of activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

930. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting an evaluation of compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

931. A letter from the Chairman, Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President, transmitting an evaluation of compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act) pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

932. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a report on compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

933. A letter from the Chief, Program Liaison Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting notification that the Air Force has suspended the General Electric Co. from obtaining any new contracts with the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

934. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting notice for a computer matching program, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

935. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting an evaluation of activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

936. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the 23d annual report of the Federal Maritime Commission for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1984, pursuant to the act of June 29, 1936, chapter 858, section 208 (90 Stat. 380); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

937. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting a report dated July 2, 1984, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with other pertinent reports, pursuant to Public Law 89-789, section 209; Public Law 90-483, section 219; Public Law 91-611, sections 216 and 217; Public Law 93-251, section 76; Public Law 94-587, section 150(b) (H. Doc. No. 99-49); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed.

938. A letter from the Chairman and Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the 51st annual report of activities of the TVA during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, pursuant to the act of May 18, 1933, chapter 32, section 9(a) (90 Stat. 377); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

939. A letter from the Chairwoman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting its 41st annual report on trade between the United States and the nonmarket economy countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2440; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

940. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal hospital insurance trust fund, transmitting the 1985 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal hospital insurance trust fund, pursuant to SSA, sections 201(c)(2), 1817(b)(2), and 1841(b)(2) H. Doc. No. 99-47; to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

941. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds, transmitting the 1985 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the Federal disability insurance trust fund, pursuant to SSA, Sections 201(c)(2), 1817(b)(2), and 1841(b)(2) (H. Doc. No. 99-46); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

942. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the examination of the office of the attending physician revolving fund's financial statements for fiscal years ending September 30, 1984 and 1983 (GAO-AFMD-85-32), pursuant to Public Law 94-59, title III (89 Stat. 283); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and House Administration.

943. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund, transmitting the 1985 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund, pursuant to SSA, sections 201(c)(2), 1817(b)(2), and 1841(b)(2) (H. Doc. No. 99-48) jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. LUNGREN):

H.R. 1847. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. Sentencing Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. BEILENSON, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 1848. A bill to amend the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 to extend the time period during which the State of California may apply for certain grants for acquisition of lands and waters and development of essential public facilities in the Santa Monica mountains zone; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 1849. A bill to extend for 5 years the existing temporary duty-free treatment of machines designed for heat set, stretch texturing of continuous manmade fibers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. COLLINS:

H.R. 1850. A bill to amend the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act to increase the aggregate of loss or damage covered at any one time by indemnity agreements made under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 1851. A bill entitled, the "Professional Football Stabilization Act of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (by request):

H.R. 1852. A bill entitled, the "Health Care Cost Containment Act of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 1853. A bill to permit certain Federal employees who retired or became entitled to receive compensation for work injury before December 9, 1980, to elect to resume coverage under the Federal employees' group life insurance program; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia):

H.R. 1854. A bill to amend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 1855. A bill to provide for requirements and procedures applicable to automobile warranties; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LELAND (for himself, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GEJENSON, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. FAZIO):

H.R. 1856. A bill to extend and improve domestic food programs; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Agriculture.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan):

H.R. 1857. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to provide competitive export financing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1858. A bill to promote industrial revitalization in the United States by establishing an Economic Cooperation Council which will collect and analyze economic data and make recommendations regarding actions which can be taken to improve the competitiveness and economic vitality of U.S. industries and by establishing the Industrial Modernization and Financing Association and the Federal Industrial Loan Corporation which will assist in providing financing for the long-term development of U.S. industries; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1859. A bill to reform the trade laws of the United States to help facilitate international trade, to strengthen the enforcement of U.S. trade rights, and provide more effective remedies for U.S. industries and workers to address injurious international trading practices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1860. A bill to stabilize the international financial system and to stimulate international growth and development; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Foreign Affairs; and Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1861. A bill to establish the Commission on the Centennial Review of the Civil Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONER of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution to designate the month of September 1985 as "National Sewing Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution concerning the United States-Japan trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H. Res. 118. Resolution authorizing the House Administration Committee to investigate, recount, and report all contested elections for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

57. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to loans to the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

58. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

59. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to unemployment compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

60. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to nuclear waste policy; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BURTON of California:

H.R. 1862. A bill for this relief of Richard John Longstaff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 1863. A bill for the relief of O. Edmund Clubb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 1864. A bill to provide that certain claims of Bobby R. Prince of Fort Smith, AR, against the United States under the tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code, shall not be barred in a civil action brought within 1 year after enactment of this bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 75: Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H.R. 75: Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H.R. 76: Mr. LEATH of Texas and Mr. CRAIG.

H.R. 469: Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 521: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. LIPINSKY, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 539: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 696: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 748: Mr. FRANKLIN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 816: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1123: Mr. ADDABBO, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1340: Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. KEMP.

H.R. 1436: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1552: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. BROWN of Colorado.

H.J. Res. 151: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. MURPHY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

72. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Saginaw, MI, relative to the President's budget proposal; which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

SENATE—Monday, April 1, 1985

(Legislative day of Monday, February 18, 1985)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O give thanks unto the Lord; call upon His name; make known His deeds among the people. Sing unto Him, sing psalms unto Him; talk of all His wondrous works. Glory in His holy name; let the heart of them rejoice that seek the Lord—Psalm 105:1-3

We worship and adore You, Almighty God—not that You need our worship, but we need to worship You. We are made to glorify You; our nature demands it. We are not just body and brain as the animal; we are human with soul to seek You and heart to love You and rejoice in Your reality.

In gratitude we contemplate and celebrate the two great Biblical events that this week recalls—Passover and Easter. We praise You, Eternal Lord, for the deliverance, freedom, resurrection and life which these events commemorate. We thank You for the gracious hope which they instill within us. Bless you, O Lord our God. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, to apprise our colleagues of the business today, under the standing order the leaders each have 10 minutes, followed by special orders not to exceed 15 minutes each for the following Senators: GORTON, HATFIELD, EVANS, STEVENS, and PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that the special orders allocated to Senators HATFIELD, EVANS, and STEVENS be under the control of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PRESSLER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Following the special orders, there will be routine morning business not to extend beyond 2 p.m. with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

Following the conclusion of morning business, it will be the intention of the majority leader to turn to any legislative or executive items cleared for action. There is still some hope we might be able to dispose of S. 413, the war risk insurance bill, and maybe the Export Administration 90-day extension. We would like to do that, obviously without floor amendments, hopefully either today or, if not, later in the week.

Tomorrow, April 2, we hope to turn to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1239, the urgent supplemental African famine relief appropriations bill, and again hopefully under a time agreement that no amendments be in order to the amendments in disagreement. Therefore, rollcall votes could occur.

On Wednesday, depending on what the House does, an extension of the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program could come before the Senate. I am not certain at this time what, if any, action will be taken.

It will also be our intention to take up a bill reported out of the Finance Committee dealing with auto record-keeping. That would be the repeal of contemporaneous recordkeeping requirements. I think there is a broad interest on both sides of the aisle. I know Senator ABDNOR, from South Dakota, and others have indicated the necessity of taking that up this week if we can.

So I would guess in all candor there is not a great deal that may happen this week unless we get into a situation on the floor where we have a number of amendments on both sides of the aisle on any bill that we bring up. So I would say to my colleagues that it now appears we could have rollcall votes tomorrow and possibly on Wednesday. I do not believe there will be a rollcall vote today, but that might depend on whether or not we can clear the war risk insurance bill or the Export Administration extension.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for laying out the program as he sees it

for the week. Is the distinguished majority leader in a position to say definitely that, when the House sends over a measure extending the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program, the measure will be called up so that the Senate can take action and hopefully the President can sign legislation that would provide for the extension?

Mr. DOLE. I am not prepared to say that at this point. I would need to consult with the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator PACKWOOD. As I recall—I have not checked—he was entertaining a markup tomorrow. The Finance Committee may not be willing to go as far as the House would go on extending the FSC Program, but they may at least, move to make certain that those who are already eligible and receiving benefits now would not be terminated immediately. The proposal they are scheduled to consider would cost about \$100 million. But I will check and make that announcement hopefully later today.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will be able to act on an extension of the FSC. As I understand it, after listening to and reading media reports, the President is opposed to an extension of the FSC. Perhaps the distinguished majority leader would be in a better position to comment on this than I am. Perhaps I should ask the distinguished majority leader that question, if he knows what the President's position is and, if so, am I correct in what I understand?

Mr. DOLE. Based again on the response the President gave at a press conference last week and based on conversations with White House personnel, it is also my understanding the President is opposed to an extension. It is not clear at this point where the President might come down if we simply permitted those who are now receiving benefits to exhaust those benefits. I hope in that case the President might be willing to sign such legislation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, the position that the President apparently takes in this regard is that he would be opposed to an extension and suggests instead that there are job training programs to which those individuals whose unemployment compensation will have expired may apply. He is suggesting job

training on the one hand while opposing the extension of Federal supplemental compensation on the other. Now, on the surface, that may appear to be a reasonable thing, but what the President is not saying is that his administration is also recommending further cuts in job training.

People who are in need and whose benefits will terminate and who will have a difficult time scraping for something with which to feed their families, should know that the President either does not know that his own administration has recommended cuts in job training or he is being disingenuous. Take whichever of the two you prefer. That is the situation as I understand it. If it is not, someone can correct me.

That being the situation, I do not think it is fair for the President to say, on the one hand, "We oppose extension of unemployment compensation, and people can fall back on job training," when it is a fact that his administration is proposing cuts in job training.

I want to voice the hope that the distinguished majority leader will be able to call up the legislation extending the program when the House sends it over. I, myself, am not interested in offering nongermane amendments to that measure, but I hope we could have an opportunity—those of us who may want to try to amend the House action, whatever it may be—to amend it so that we can perhaps come out with a better program than what may appear to a last resort that would be offered to us. What I am saying is that I hope we would have an opportunity to amend the subject matter with relevant and germane amendments. As to offering nongermane amendments, I am not saying that I can get an agreement to limit such a bill to germane amendments.

I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, do I still have some time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader has 3½ minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield that time to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me suggest that we will try to accommodate the distinguished minority leader. I will be checking with the appropriate administration officials.

I do know that there are probably some who would offer nongermane amendments. Perhaps they can be dissuaded, and perhaps we can work out some arrangement on unemployment benefits.

I think it is also fair to say that nothing prevents the States, some of which are flush with money, from giving additional benefits. The State of Maryland already has done that. The State of Oregon is doing that. There may be others, but we can

debate that later. It is the Federal Government that is out of money.

I know the expiration of the FSC Program works a hardship on many unemployed workers—in the neighborhood of 300,000 or 350,000. So I suggest that even though the Federal Government does not act, that should not preclude action by State governments, many of which are talking about tax cuts, massive tax reductions, because of their surpluses. This might be an opportunity for them to address a real problem.

In any event, we will be working on that, and I will keep the minority leader advised.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. I understand the reasoning of what he has just said.

The legislative bodies of some States, however, will not be meeting at this time. Some have scheduled meetings in odd-numbered years; some have meetings in even-numbered years, and some meet every year. I think that might be a problem with some of the State legislatures.

In addition, I think this is the kind of thing that should be a standard measure throughout the country. Otherwise, it would end up being a situation which is pretty much like the present situation now in regard to extended benefits and supplemental benefits. As I understand it, the extended benefits program is beneficial to only three States that now meet the eligibility requirements. So we have a kind of patchwork situation now: The basic unemployment insurance; then extended insurance for which only three States, including my own, can apply; and then we have the third tier, which is the supplemental.

A third of the States now have unemployment rates that are above the national average, certainly above 8 percent, as I understand it. My State still has the dubious distinction of leading the 50 States in that regard. We still have about 16 percent unemployment.

I thank the distinguished majority leader.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GORTON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, is this pursuant to a special order; and if so, under what terms and conditions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington now controls four special orders, pursuant to previous orders, for a total of 1 hour.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Chair.

EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY OF FORMER SENATOR WARREN MAGNUSON

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I sought to set aside an hour today so that my colleagues and I could take the opportunity to pause for a few minutes from the hectic pace of the Senate to salute Warren Magnuson on his 80th birthday, which will occur on April 12, while we are in recess.

Mr. President, no Senator in this century, perhaps in the history of our Nation, has ever had, in one sense a more difficult, and yet, in another, an easier task than I have had replacing my predecessor—Warren G. Magnuson. It has been difficult because few Senators have had to replace someone whose record of service to his country and his State was as long and as honorable as that of Warren Magnuson. On the other hand, it has been easy because few Senators have ever had as clear and as broad a trail of service blazed for him by his predecessor. One cannot proceed anywhere through our Federal laws or Government without finding his footprints. In some areas, such as health, consumer affairs, and fisheries, his presence still dominates the landscape.

The legislation extending this Nation's jurisdiction 200 miles off our shores to include the world's most productive fishing grounds is proudly and properly named the Magnuson Act.

Health science facilities from the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda to the University of Washington in Seattle bear his name.

One of our most basic consumer protection laws is the Magnuson-Moss Act. Simply put, Warren Magnuson has left an enduring and valued mark on our society matched by few others.

For example, Senator Magnuson was the first Member of this body to advocate recognition of the People's Republic of China.

A second and more personal reason why his trail has been easy to follow is the consistently generous time and good counsel he has shared with me on numerous occasions since 1980. Perhaps nothing in his career shows what a true statesman he is, and shows his love for Washington State more, than the fact that several times every year he has provided the person who replaced him the benefit of his wisdom and perspective and the delight of his company and experiences.

Warren Magnuson spent almost half a century in these Chambers attempting to put America first and Washington State second; partisanship and special, narrow interests are not his legacy.

Warren Magnuson spent half a century in Washington, DC, seeking to unite the State and the Nation.

Warren Magnuson spent half a century in Washington, DC, never stint-

ing of himself or his efforts when they could help people as broad classes or as individuals looking for thoughtful constituent services.

Those have been the hallmarks of effective public service which I have tried to take to heart and which have been burned indelibly in my mind—and they will continue as long as I am in the Senate.

Should God grant me even half the years in the Senate that Warren Magnuson was granted, and if the voters grant me the same privilege, I hope to follow his trail. I would be flattered and honored if some day I were regarded as the kind of Senator who we all know that Warren Magnuson was.

Maggie, we all wish you a very happy 80th birthday and many more to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if it is appropriate pursuant to these special orders set aside for me, that up to 5 minutes be granted to any other Member of the Senate during that period of time to speak on the same subject as he or she wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. President, I am proud to join with my colleague from the State of Washington to honor Warren Magnuson on his 80th birthday.

He served in this body for almost 40 years and, as my colleague has pointed out, served in Congress for almost half a century, a half century of enormous change in this country, a half century of a new deal, of a world war, of several conflicts after that, of the great society program; and during that period of time, Warren Magnuson always was a good friend not only of the Nation and the people he represented but of the State of Washington.

I had the privilege during 12 of those years serving as Governor of the State of Washington to meet with Warren Magnuson on many, many occasions on behalf of issues which were important to the State. Never did I find him do anything but the utmost to be of service, help, and usually of leadership in providing for the needs of our State.

Hardly anyone, however, knows him as Warren Magnuson. He has been Maggie to his voters and constituents in the State of Washington, to his colleagues in the Senate, and to his friends for many, many years.

He never became pompous or self-important, but he perhaps like only a few in this body really became a Senator's Senator, thoroughly at home in these Chambers, thoroughly at home in the use of power, thoroughly at home in the understanding of what it took to put together the coalitions and the necessary votes for important issues, but I think he will be mostly re-

membered because he cared very much about people who have little power, people who needed help, people who were poor and homeless and sick, and the reason his name is on so many medical facilities is not because of the appropriations he gained for those facilities but because he cared, cared personally about those people and their problems.

The stories about and by Maggie are legion. But I think that I enjoy most one that happened to me when I visited Warren Magnuson shortly after he became President pro tempore of the Senate. He told me that a special phone had been put in his office shortly after he became President pro tempore, and he showed me the phone and said that the first time he saw it he went over and picked up the phone and immediately a voice came over saying, "The White House," and he was so flustered he said, "I've got the wrong number," and hung up, and, of course, he laughed uproariously at himself for a story that I think perhaps as well as any showed him as a man of no pretensions, no pompousness, but it reflected the reality of Maggie.

I join with my colleagues in the Senate in extending the happiest of birthday celebrations to Warren Magnuson on 40 full and productive years and he still, after 80 years, is offering advice and help to those of us who are struggling to serve the people of the Nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to honor our former colleague from the State of Washington, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, on the celebration of his 80th birthday. Because I served with him on the Appropriations and the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committees, I came to know him well. With every hearing, markup, and debate, my admiration and respect for him deepened. I miss him, and so does our Nation.

Senator Magnuson led the fight for a clean, healthful environment before it became a popular cause; he championed the cause of the consumer before the consumerism movement was formed; he fought for civil rights and racial equality in our immigration laws and was criticized for doing so; he had the foresight to advance health programs that improved the welfare and prolonged the lives of millions; he and our late colleague Henry "Scoop" Jackson provided the State of Washington and our Nation with statesmen of the highest international stature.

As a small gesture of our profound respect and deep affection for Senator Magnuson, the Senate Democratic Conference on March 26 adopted a

resolution honoring Maggie on his birthday celebration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the conference resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION HONORING WARREN G. MAGNUSON

Whereas, the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson will be celebrating his 80th birthday on April 12, 1985;

Whereas, the former Democratic Senator from Washington is remembered by his colleagues as exemplifying the highest ideals and goals of our nation's lawmakers;

Whereas, during his chairmanship of the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation from 1955 through 1977 more than 200 measures authored by Senator Magnuson became law, among them landmark legislation improving consumer protection, environmental policy, and transportation;

Whereas, Senator Magnuson's initiatives included the establishment of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Amtrak, Conrail, the National Science Foundation, truth in advertising and packaging laws, protection of oceans against waste disposal, automobile safety requirements, and many other major measures;

Whereas, as a member and later Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Magnuson authorized measures to substantially improve national health programs by establishing the National Institutes of Health, the National Cancer Institute, and the National Health Service Corps;

Whereas, Senator Magnuson actively supported his Democrat colleagues as Chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and served as an unofficial but influential advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt;

Whereas, the first measure enacted to abolish racial discrimination in modern American immigration law—the repeal of anti-Asian exclusion laws—was authored by Senator Magnuson;

Whereas, the legacy of Senator Warren G. Magnuson epitomizes the highest ideals of the Democratic Party, and whereas the many legislative achievements of Senator Magnuson serves as a standard by which current and future senators can be measured, but cannot hope to equal;

Be it resolved, that the Senate Democratic Conference honors the historic accomplishments of Senator Magnuson, extends our warmest birthday wishes to Maggie, and sends our warmest hopes for health, happiness and contentment to the Magnuson family.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to extend good wishes to a former colleague who, in his retirement, is flourishing.

And it is a special pleasure to wish Warren Magnuson a happy 80th birthday.

Warren was an esteemed and valued colleague who served this body with distinction for many years.

While I am certain he is enjoying his life away from the Capitol, we in the Senate miss his presence.

I know those Senators who served with Senator Magnuson over the years

will want to join with me in sending him our congratulations and best wishes for continued good health and many more happy birthdays.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Senate just isn't the same without Warren Magnuson but it brings me pleasure nonetheless that he will celebrate his 80th birthday on April 12 without having to worry about Budget Committee reductions in his Labor-HHS appropriations bill or countless other pressing legislative matters.

I know he will enjoy this birthday in his beautiful State of Washington as he so richly deserves. No one fought harder or longer for the people of this country than Maggie. There are many institutions and organizations that miss his enthusiastic support. The American labor movement, public health hospitals, the National Institutes of Health, the National Cancer Institute, those associated with education or consumer issues—each of these groups remember Maggie fondly and with great respect.

And so does the Senate. So, Mr. President, we all today send a big happy birthday winging out to the west coast to our friend, colleague, and chairman, Warren Magnuson. Happy birthday, Maggie, and many, many more.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege and an honor for those of us who served with Warren Magnuson to join today in this 80th birthday tribute to one of the greatest Senators who ever graced this Chamber.

What a friend the State of Washington has in Warren Magnuson; what a colleague he was to all of us; What achievements he has wrought from the country and its people.

He served the Nation in the Congress from 1937 to 1980—the last 36 years in this Chamber.

In that time he became known as Mr. Consumer in the Congress, the champion of the worker, the protector of the average citizen.

His accomplishments are legendary. President Kennedy used to say that Warren Magnuson was the kind of Senator who walks quietly into the Chamber, offers an amendment late in the day—and it turns out to be the Grand Coulee Dam.

No State has ever been served more effectively by their Senators than the State of Washington in the extraordinary years of service by those two unusual leaders of the Senate, Warren Magnuson and Henry Jackson. As Senator Magnuson said recently of the remarkable relationship, "we served together in the House and Senate almost half a century. We worked as a team, shoulder to shoulder."

Senator Magnuson deserves great credit for the State of Washington's remarkable economic growth. The vitality of the aerospace and the defense and the timber industries; the incredi-

ble growth of hydroelectric power that has made the region so rich in energy resources; the protection of Puget Sound from supertankers that are as unsafe as they are unwanted—these are but a small part of the Magnuson legacy, the unique results of one man's vision and his ability to make Government work the way it should—to translate programs into progress for the benefit of all the people of his State.

Senator Magnuson was also a miracle worker for people of the State of Washington who needed help.

If an injured aircraft worker had trouble with his disability claim, Warren Magnuson could sort it out.

If a worker who had lost his job had trouble with his unemployment benefits, Warren Magnuson would put it right.

If an elderly person had lost a Social Security check, Warren Magnuson would get another one.

And if a small business person had trouble with a government contract, he did not need a lawyer—he needed Warren Magnuson. In countless ways like these, he made the system work.

I had the honor and the pleasure of serving and working with Senator Magnuson for 18 years. And I can tell you that there is no Member of the Senate with whom I worked more closely or for whom I had higher respect.

But I admire Senator Magnuson most for his unparalleled leadership in the cause of better health care for America.

Because of Warren Magnuson, America is renowned throughout the world for the extraordinary quality of our medical research. As a Senator, he was the commander in chief of the war against cancer and heart disease. He was the father of one of the most successful government health programs ever enacted, the National Health Service Corps, which brought medical care to countless rural areas in America that never had a doctor.

For achievements like these and many more, I was always proud to salute Senator Magnuson as Mr. Health Care in the United States.

All Americans have been touched by, and benefited from, the health programs he nurtured. He has never wavered from his commitment to decent quality health care for all citizens, at a price they can afford to pay. His own words say it best:

A lot of human misery I saw as a youngster was caused by cancer. I saw healthy men and women in the prime of life suddenly fold up and die or waste away—and no one knew why. It just made good sense to do everything we could to find the answers—and the cures.

I am convinced that more money for research now will save this nation millions of dollars in the years to come. To those who would pursue a pennywise-and-pound-foolish policy, closing their eyes to the long-

range gains of this program [the National Cancer Institute], I say, you may not only lose your pennies, but the very heritage of democracy itself. Our best exhibit of our democratic experiment lies, not in talking about human welfare, but in continually practicing it.

Our relentless and humane fight to save thousands upon thousands of Americans every year from death . . . is the most accurate barometer I know of our real concept of human values.

It is our firm answer to the totalitarianisms which hold that the individual is insignificant, particularly the weak and sick.

In 1980, I had the honor of offering a joint resolution in the Senate to name the proposed new clinical research center at NIH after Senator Magnuson. The Warren Grant Magnuson Research Center of the National Institutes of Health opened its doors in the spring of 1982. In the time since then, the Magnuson Center has tripled the ambulatory care research activities of the NIH and now cares for 78,000 patients a year. It is particularly appropriate that this facility, which takes the basic research conducted at NIH and applies it to research on the most humane and effective methods of patient care, is named for this giant of health care in modern America, Warren Magnuson.

It is often said that how a nation cares for its sick is a measure of its humanity, and its humanity is a measure of its greatness. Warren Magnuson's dedication to health research and health care are a measure of his own humanity and his greatness. I am proud to join today in these congratulations on his 80th birthday, and I say to my dear and indestructible friend—may his next 80 years be even greater than the first.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Washington Post in 1981 on the Magnuson Research Center at NIH may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 22, 1981]

A NEW NAME, NEW CLINICS FOR NIH CENTER
(By Victor Cohn)

It is the world's largest "clinical research center," a place where the medical laboratory meets the patient.

Starting today, by act of Congress, the giant research hospital at the National Institutes of Health will be known as the Warren Grant Magnuson Clinical Center, for the Washington Democrat who has been its friend.

Translate "friend" into "moneymen." Until he lost his seat last November, "Maggie" was the longtime chairman of the Senate health appropriations subcommittee, and he usually gave NIH more than any president asked.

Today, too, the new Magnuson Center will officially spawn an addition, another product of congressional friendship. It will be dedicated by Health and Human Services Secretary Richard S. Schweiker, who was

also a friend of NIH when he was on the Hill.

The addition will be a giant, \$100 million set of out-patient clinics and laboratories with the rather awkward name of the Ambulatory Care Research Facility. Together, the 29-year-old hospital building and the new clinics should be the laboratory for the medical care of the next century.

The clinical center is only one part of the vast NIH campus in Bethesda. There are also 11 institutes dealing with various diseases and parts of the human anatomy. With a 1981 budget of \$73.6 million, the center accounts for a little more than a tenth of the \$668.2 million spent on the NIH campus. (Most of NIH's total \$3.6 billion budget finances research at hospitals and universities around the country.)

The center is the institute's very own, highly unusual hospital. The older building is split down the middle, with patients on one side of each floor and research laboratories on the other. Doctors and scientists go from one to the other, testing and applying new findings.

The care is all free—that is, paid by the taxpayers—for patients referred by doctors all over the country. Under the rules, a patient must fit into a "research protocol" or ongoing program, which often tests one kind of treatment against another.

Out of this marriage of care and research has come the first successful chemotherapy of a cancer (choriocarcinoma); "combination chemotherapies" using batteries of drugs against leukemias and lymphomas; work on the chemistry of mental illness, leading to new drugs; and practical discoveries and new treatments in arthritis, heart disease, high blood pressure, genetic disorders, infections and other conditions.

Most of this work was done by studies on hospitalized patients. But medical care has been changing since 1952, when the hospital building was first occupied. More and more diseases, even cancer, can be treated on an out-patient or ambulatory basis, that is, on patients who walk in, get some attention and leave.

This is the main reason for building the new facility, Dr. Mortimer Lipsett, the Center's director, said yesterday.

"The clinical researcher," he said, "is the man who stands with one foot in the laboratory and one foot at the bedside. He takes the new information from the lab and tries to bring it to the patient."

"Today, however, he doesn't always have to do this at a bedside. And the fact that we have this new facility will also enable us to look at many less life-threatening but still important conditions."

Among them: asthma, allergies, many mental conditions, eye diseases, nerve disorders and pain. Pain alone will be the concern of one entire new clinic.

To help treat and study patients with these conditions, the new 14-story facility will have extensive patient-testing laboratories and many X-ray and other machines to look under the skin at illness. Like the older building, the new facility will have both basic research laboratories and patient clinics on the same floor.

The older, 504-bed hospital has 1,246,860 square feet of usable space. The new facility will add 685,000 square feet. Together, they will handle 7,600 hospitalized patients and 100,000 out-patient visits a year at the start. Ultimately, the new facility may accommodate 250,000 out-patient visits a year.

So far, only some cancer laboratories have been established in the new building. But

the first patient clinics and other labs will be occupied before the end of the year, and the building should be in full use by mid-1982.

To some extent, the pace will depend on the still uncertain fiscal 1982 appropriations, and the extent to which NIH and the Magnuson Center feel President Reagan's call for a 12 percent cut in 1982 spending plans.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 23, 1981]

MAGNUSON SOLACES NIH DOCTORS

(By Victor Cohn and Cristine Russell)

Doctors at the National Institutes of Health, worried about Reagan administration budget cuts, were told by a Democratic veteran of budget wars yesterday to "hunker down" until the slashes of this "fleeting moment" are ended and future congresses surely come to their rescue.

The hardly unpolitical message came from former Washington Senator Warren G. Magnuson, powerful dispenser of billions of health-research dollars until his defeat last November. The occasion was the rededication of NIH's big clinical center and research hospital as the Warren Grant Magnuson Center plus the dedication of a new \$100 million addition for out-patient care.

Magnuson's message had to be read for him. The 76-year-old former lawmaker said he could not attend the dedication for "personal reasons." A former aide said he is well but had just moved from one Seattle home to another, which seemed to be "enough activity" now.

The dedication's main speaker, Health and Human Services Secretary Richard S. Schweiker, praised Magnuson as "commander in chief" in the war against cancer and heart disease during his many years as virtual ruler of Senate Health appropriations.

President Reagan has called for a 12 percent cutback in all federal spending, but some observers think Congress will spare NIH at least part of the ax. NIH is currently operating on a continuing resolution which prolongs its fiscal 1981 appropriation level of \$3.6 billion until Nov. 20.

Schweiker did not mention appropriations, but said only that "both President Reagan and I are committed" to maintaining NIH as "a unique national enterprise."

NIH also has other concerns. It has been without a director since the unexpected resignation of Dr. Donald Fredrickson last July; five of its 11 institutes either lack or will soon lack directors, and several other key jobs are open. All the lesser jobs await selection of a new director to fill Fredrickson's post as chief dispenser of research dollars to the entire American medical community.

Schweiker told a reporter yesterday he has just received a short list of nominees and he hopes to send a nomination to the White House "within a couple of weeks," with a director on board by the first of the year.

The list was chosen by a committee under Dr. Edward Brandt Jr., HHS assistant Secretary for Health, who said yesterday that more than 100 names had been received.

HHS, Capitol Hill and scientific sources say these doctors are among those who have been under serious consideration:

Dr. Richard Krause, head of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease, an inside NIH favorite; Dr. Baruj Benacerraf, a Harvard Nobel Prize winner; Dr. William Danforth, of the Washington University Medical School, who is a brother of Sen. John Danforth (R-Mo.). A top department

official said, however, that Danforth has pulled himself out of the running.

CORRECTION

[October 25, 1981]: In a story Friday on the National Institutes of Health, several names of those reported to be under serious consideration for the post of director were inadvertently omitted. They included Drs. Eugene Braunwald, a Harvard professor of medicine; Julius Krevans, medical school dean at the University of California, San Francisco, and James Wyngaarden of Duke University Medical School, as well as pharmaceutical executives W. Clarke Wescoe, formerly of the University of Kansas, and Theodore Cooper, who previously held several top government health posts.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I wish to offer my sincere congratulations to Warren Magnuson on his 80th birthday on April 12.

Those of us who served with him have all benefited from his leadership and wisdom.

The Senate it is a far better body because Warren Magnuson was here and he played a key role in the development of the Senate for so many years.

His place in history is secure, and I am honored to be numbered among his legion of admirers.

Warren, happy birthday.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in extending our congratulations to the distinguished former Senator from the State of Washington, Mr. Magnuson.

It was a great privilege to me to serve for many years in the Senate with Warren Magnuson, and I certainly acknowledge with gratitude all that I learned by observing his astute leadership in the Senate and in particular his leadership in the Committee on Appropriations.

We, in the State of Maryland, owe a considerable debt to Warren Magnuson for a number of projects that were funded by appropriations, projects that I think improved the State of Maryland, but one experience that I had with him comes to mind as I think about his 80th birthday today.

There was an opportunity to acquire an historic property in Maryland, the home of one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Stone—an historic Maryland plantation house known as Habre de Venture. The National Park Service was interested in acquiring this property as a national historic site and as an opportunity to protect some of the open space that is within the perimeter of the Greater Washington metropolitan area.

So it had several inducements for acquisition by the public. It was historic preservation and it was environmental preservation at the same time and offered a chance for greater recreation for the people of the area.

I took all of these arguments to Senator Magnuson as chairman of the Ap-

propriations Committee and urged him to provide us with the funds to make this important addition to the National Parks System. He was a watchdog of the Treasury. He was careful about appropriations that were made. He had to be convinced that they were right.

And he immediately asked me, "How much was the house of Thomas Stone?" And I said that it would be \$600,000 and that I did not think the Park Service could negotiate a lower figure. He said that was a lot of money, even for the home of a signer of the Declaration of Independence. And I could see the chance of acquiring that property was diminishing as the dollar figures clicked across his mind.

"But," I said, "Mr. Chairman, just consider that with the house we also get the signer, because Thomas Stone is buried in a family graveyard close to the house." And with that consideration, he changed his mind. He said he would support the appropriation.

And so the Nation now has a valuable and historic property. One of Maryland's historic landmarks is guaranteed preservation. I think the Nation has made a good investment.

But it is sometimes interesting to reflect on those small episodes which are indicative of how decisions are made. And on Warren Magnuson's birthday, I would like to take the opportunity of saying, on behalf of the people of Maryland, not only happy birthday and many happy returns but thanks for all the interest and consideration that he has given to our welfare in the years gone by.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my former colleague, Senator Warren Magnuson, on the occasion of his 80th birthday. To those of us who know him, Maggie exemplifies the qualities of caring, compassion, and concern that are so important in a representative of the people. During his illustrious 44 years in the Senate, Maggie served not only the people of the State of Washington, but all Americans. As President pro tempore of the Senate, he spent many long hours working to ensure that the business of this body was conducted in a professional and effective manner. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he set an example by dedicating himself to the task of working with his colleagues in order to meet the needs of Americans. He is admired and respected by his peers as a colleague and as a friend.

When Maggie first came to this body in 1938, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President of the United States. Few among us can remember those turbulent times—the end of the Dust Bowl era, the beginning of the Second World War. But Maggie's concern for his fellow beings was evident then, as he was instrumental in the passage of

legislation which established the National Cancer Institute in 1938—the forerunner of the National Institutes of Health. It was an honor and a privilege to serve with someone who has been such an important part of creating the America we know today. I am proud to join with my colleagues in wishing Warren "Maggie" Magnuson many happy returns of the day!

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I would like to join the chorus in celebrating the 80th birthday of Senator Warren G. Magnuson. Maggie used to love to say that if he knew he was going to live this long, he would have taken better care of himself. Well, the good Lord has taken care of this exceptional, humble, and caring man as he, for so many years, took care of the needs of the citizens of Washington State and the Nation.

Senator Magnuson's legislative achievements during his 44 years of service in this body are legion. They span a host of areas, including major initiatives in the fields of health care, health care research, consumer protection, the preservation of our fishing resources and our wildlife, the improvement of our educational system, and the promotion of civil rights for all Americans. Of all his achievements, I think he would be most proud of the title "citizen legislator." For Maggie was, above all, a man of the people. He was a dogged and persistent advocate for the rights of the poor, the sick, the elderly, the disadvantaged, and the dispossessed. He was the voice of the voiceless.

We all know how effective Senator Magnuson was in delivering projects for his beloved State of Washington. Yet he was always willing to listen to and to try to accommodate the needs of other Senators. I shall never forget the many kindnesses he extended to me as the most junior Senator of the Senate Appropriations Committee in 1977. Senator Magnuson knew the West. He understood the West, and he was enormously helpful to me as I tried to meet the needs of my State of Arizona. The kindness and consideration he extended to me in his capacity as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee were extended to all Members, regardless of party. During his entire legislative career, I don't think Maggie made an enemy. He only made friends and I am certain I express the views of all his former colleagues in saying, we miss you, Maggie. We miss your leadership, we miss your talents, and we miss your warm and hospitable personality. And we all send our best wishes for a very happy birthday and continued good health in the days and years to come.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to join with many of my distinguished colleagues today in congratulating Senator Warren Magnuson on the upcom-

ing occasion of his 80th birthday. I am proud that I am the second in my family who has had the privilege of serving in the Congress with Maggie. Not only did Senator Magnuson and I serve together in the U.S. Senate, but my father, Lyle H. Boren, served with Maggie in the U.S. House of Representatives. Thus, the Borens and the Magnusons share a mutual friendship and respect which spans two generations, and continues even today.

When I was first elected to this body in 1978, Senator and Mrs. Magnuson were among the very first to contact my wife, Molly, and me and offer their friendship and help as we moved of Washington. Mrs. Magnuson graciously served as Molly's "Big Sister" in the Senate.

It would be impossible to list all of Senator Magnuson's many accomplishments during his 44 years of service in the Congress, beginning with his first election to the U.S. House of Representatives from the First District of the State of Washington in 1937 and spanning a Senate career which began in 1944, when he was appointed to fill the unexpired term of Senator Homer T. Bone.

However, among the accomplishments for which he is best known are his work as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee on proposals to improve our consumer protection laws. These included the Fair Labeling and Packaging Act of 1966, which tightened the standards for package descriptions; the Auto Safety Act of 1966; the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, which requires warning labels on each package; the Flammable Fabrics Act, which attempted to reduce the death toll from clothing fires; the truth-in-lending laws, which clarified interest rates and credit terms; the Child Protection Act, which set safety standards for toys to prevent poisonous substances from being used on children's products, and other important pieces of legislation.

He was also an advocate of environmental safety and introduced bills to promote conservation of our precious land, air, water, and wildlife resources.

During the 91st Congress, Maggie became chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, an assignment which controlled funding for health services. As chairman of this subcommittee, Senator Magnuson sponsored the National Health Service Corps to send teams of doctors to remote and impoverished areas as well as several bills aimed at improving children's health, including the Teeth for Tots program and the Children's Catastrophic Health Care Act, which provided for emergency medical expenses when they exceeded 5 percent of a family's income. Along with my Dad, Senator Magnuson helped establish the National Cancer Institute in

1937, a forerunner of the National Institutes of Health.

There have been many stories told of the successes which Senator Magnuson reaped in gaining funds and projects for the State of Washington during his many years in Congress. Clearly, his experience and knowledge of the legislative process enabled him to make a significant mark on the State which he so ably represented. Yet, he did so in a congenial and friendly manner, and not in an overbearing way, always striving for consensus on his committee and in this Chamber.

This quote, from President John F. Kennedy, during a stop in Seattle 8 months after becoming Chief Executive, epitomizes Maggie's political style. President Kennedy said, "Most Members of the Senate, as you can already judge, have developed the art of speaking with precision and clarity and force. The secret of Senator Magnuson's meteoric Senate career has been the reverse. He may make clear speeches to you on great public questions. But in Washington he speaks in the Senate so quietly that few can hear him. He looks down at his desk. . . . He is very hesitant about interrupting other Members of the Senate. . . . He sends his messages up to the Senate; everyone says, 'What is it?' and Senator Magnuson says, 'Well, it's nothing important,' and Grand Coulee Dam is built."

Those of us who have had the privilege of knowing and serving with Senator Magnuson are deeply appreciative of his friendship and knowledge. He is missed very much by Members of both the Senate and the House. It is in tribute that we join together today to say, "Happy Birthday, Maggie. May your future years continue to be productive ones. Thank you for the important role you have played in shaping the future of our country, and of the State of Washington."

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is a great privilege for me to join with other Senators on congratulating Senator Warren G. Magnuson on his 80th birthday.

Senator Magnuson served his Nation with great distinction in the House of Representatives and in the Senate for a total of 44 years. Although I did not have the opportunity to work with him in the Senate, I know that his accomplishments are still evident in my home State of Alaska.

Warren Magnuson's impact on Alaska began when he was a Congressman, as evidenced by his efforts, dating to 1938, to have the Alaska Highway built.

As chairman of the Labor, Health, Education and Welfare Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Magnuson worked closely with Senator TED STEVENS in completely modernizing the health delivery

system in rural Alaska. These efforts led to the construction of new facilities, such as the hospital in Bethel, AK. That hospital provides essential health care services to residents of the Yukon-Kuskokwim region.

Senator Magnuson was a leading spokesman for the commercial fishing industry. In 1975, he sponsored the act that established our Nation's 200-mile fishery conservation and management zone. It is safe to say that this act, now appropriately known as the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, not only saved many species of fish from overharvesting by foreign distant water fleets, but has given the U.S. fishing industry the legal base upon which to grow and prosper. Commercial fishing is an extremely important facet of Alaska's economy and all Alaskans owe Senator Magnuson our deepest appreciation for his work in this area.

Mr. President, Senator Warren G. Magnuson has given his all to serve the public interest in the House and Senate. I welcome the occasion of his 80th birthday to note my deep gratitude for his distinguished service to our Nation and to Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I join to celebrate the second anniversary of the second round of 39th birthdays for my good friend, Senator Warren Magnuson.

I remember so well my first days in Washington, DC, as an appointed Senator from the State of Alaska. Warren literally took me under his wing—no partisanship involved. He was the chairman of the Commerce Committee at that time. Warren and I were neighbors—I used to call him my "Southern Neighbor." To me, Warren Magnuson was one of the true statesmen of my time here in the Senate.

In any event, I watched, listened and learned—and learned, and learned. Senator Magnuson was a wealth of knowledge. He was constantly passing on something new to me about the Senate, politics, or public policy. Because he invested his life's work in the service of the Senate and the State of Washington, he was a good teacher.

Together we worked on the 200-mile limit legislation, which was named, at my request, the "Magnuson Fisheries and Conservation Management Act." We also worked together on the Appropriations Committee. The State of Alaska was always well treated under Senator Magnuson's leadership—he had helped us become a State and did all he could to assure that we made the transition early.

Warren Magnuson is a living legend. I believe the records will show that he, as chairman, sponsored more long-lasting reforms than any other Senator in history.

I recall an article written by the late Senator from the State of Washing-

ton, Senator Scoop Jackson, describing his colleague. He wrote:

Senator Magnuson did more during those 40 years to better the quality of life for his fellow human beings than any other U.S. Senator.

It is appropriate that we honor Senator Magnuson's 80th birthday—he is special to so many of us in the Senate. We congratulate him and wish him well for many years to come.

Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues from the State of Washington in honoring our former colleague, and I might add a native Minnesotan, Warren Magnuson on his 80th birthday.

Warren Magnuson served the State of Washington and our country as a Member of Congress for over 40 years. He did so with great skill and distinction. This, of course, can be attributed to spending the formative years of his life in Minnesota's Red River Valley. Maggie was born in Moorhead MI, where he attended the public schools. From there he crossed the Red River and headed north to attend the University of North Dakota at Grand Forks, as do many high school graduates from that area of my state.

Anyone familiar with Maggie's congressional career can see this background served him well. It is truly amazing to me that he spent 44 years in Congress, 36 of those in the U.S. Senate. I served with him only his last 2 years, but that was certainly enough to develop a deep respect for his abilities and his accomplishments. He is a warm, personable man and I offer my hearty congratulations on this 80th birthday.

I also want to commend our colleague, SLADE GORTON, for organizing this tribute to his predecessor. In our business we do not always find this sort of relationship between former foes. Maggie and SLADE can serve as an example for us all and they both deserve our commendation.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I certainly want to add my voice to the many that will be joining to wish Warren Magnuson the happiest of 80th birthdays. I trust that April 12 will be a lovely day for our former colleague.

Indeed, we miss his presence in this fascinating area. "Maggie's" personality added a unique dimension to this body. It was always a treat to work with him. He had a great way about him—with an uncommon degree of common sense, and a skill and ability that was awesome to watch.

Warren Magnuson served here in the Senate with my own dear father—and was very kind to me, I first came here in 1978. That kindness continued throughout our mutual time here together—and was very much appreciated, I assure you.

So it is just a pleasure for me to join in wishing "Maggie" a happy 80th birthday. I know my father would join in sending his kindest and most sincere birthday regards as well. We are all thinking of you on this happy occasion and send our thoughts and prayers and greetings to you. My wife Ann joins in these expressions of affection and we would both wish him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to wish the happiest of birthday celebrations to Warren Magnuson on the 80th birthday of this remarkable man. It was my great pleasure to serve with Maggie in the Senate from 1977 until his retirement, and I remember his friendship with great fondness.

Maggie is unique. His unassuming and self-conscious manner won his friends throughout the Nation. At the same time, his tireless efforts on behalf of health research, consumer protection, foreign policy and ocean policy earned him the respect of all. He capped his distinguished career, which spanned 45 years, as President pro tempore of the Senate, a position which he filled admirably.

Mr. President, I commend my colleagues for taking this time to honor a great friend. Maggie, I wish you the very best on this special day, and many happy returns.

A NATIONAL TREASURE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is indeed fitting that we pay tribute to former Senator Warren Magnuson on his 80th birthday. Those of us in the Fargo area feel we shared Maggie with the State of Washington. He grew up in our community and had deep roots in it. As a matter of fact, while he served in the Senate, he was a director of the Dakota National Bank in Fargo and came to our town on a number of occasions to visit his many friends there. Maggie is indeed a self-made man. It was a privilege to meet him across the conference table on the many appropriations bills we worked on while I was in the House, and his background was often an ace in the hole for the needs of North Dakota. A little over a year ago, I was in the Seattle area and, following a series of meetings, Warren and Germaine invited me to their home for dinner with a group of their friends. It was a delightful evening of reminiscing, and I can report to my colleagues that Maggie is hale and hearty in his new house overlooking the beautiful bay. In fact, if he is as good as he looks, I imagine we shall be celebrating his 90th birthday with congratulations to him from the floor of the Senate. The State of Washington may claim Maggie as her own, but to me and so many of his colleagues, he is a national treasure.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, an 80th birthday is always an auspicious event. When the birthday is Senator

Warren G. Magnuson's, it has special meaning for all of us. Senator Magnuson, our distinguished former colleague and always our good friend, spent more than half his life in service to the Nation, first entering the House of Representatives nearly 50 years ago—in 1937—and the Senate in 1945. He can justly survey those years with satisfaction, in the knowledge of a difficult job well done, just as we survey the accomplishments of his long service with admiration and respect.

Senator Magnuson was an effective advocate for the concerns of his home State of Washington at the same time that he proved himself time and again to be a legislator with a strong sense of the national interest. It was he, more than any other single Member, who secured inclusion of public accommodations provisions in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It was he who, in 1970, first sponsored legislation to establish Federal standards for warranties on consumer products, legislation finally enacted into law 4 years later; and he chaired the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs that produced the Flammable Fabrics Act, the School Bus Safety Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Truth in Package Act, and other measures that set standards we now accept as a matter of course.

Warren Magnuson understood the importance, both to his State and to the Nation, of maritime resources. It was he who sponsored the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, by formal Senate action now officially titled the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, and he who took a leading role in the enactment of legislation to protect the country against oil spills and to husband our marine resources. As a spokesman on health issues, Senator Magnuson had few peers in the Congress. Small wonder that in 1973 he was awarded the Albert Lasker Public Service in Health Award for his support of basic medical research programs, or that the clinical center at the National Institutes of Health is known today as the Warren Grant Magnuson Clinical Center.

Throughout his long career, Warren Magnuson was a skillful and distinguished legislator whose ability and dedication to his work were an inspiration. First as chairman of the Commerce Committee, subsequently as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he took on the most difficult challenges a Member of this body can face. He knew the Congress and his colleagues well and had a deep and uncompromising respect for the institution of the Senate in which he served. That knowledge, that respect, served him well. He was a wise and expert leader; America is the better for his efforts. And for all of us, he remains a good and true friend.

WARM ASSESSMENTS OF SENATOR LONG'S CAREER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in 1949, RUSSELL B. LONG, son of one of America's most famous political figures, took his seat in the Senate, representing the State of Louisiana. This year, after 36 years in this chamber, Senator LONG announced that he will not seek reelection when his current term ends in 1986.

When he retires, Senator LONG will have served 38 years in the Senate. In retirement, he will be able to look back on a career in which he was often a central figure or participant in making some of the most important decisions affecting modern American history—a career of which Senator LONG can be genuinely proud.

A recent article in the Washington Times shared some retrospectives on Senator LONG's life and career, both by Senator LONG himself and by others, some of them his colleagues here in the Senate and others friends and associates from his past. The article captures much of the wit and compelling color that have marked Senator LONG's Senate style, as well as incisive judgment and practicality for which he is noted. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The End of the Long Era," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Mar. 21, 1985]

THE END OF THE LONG ERA

(By Jim Watson)

Thirty-six years ago, a stocky, wire-haired man named Russell B. Long strolled down the aisles of the U.S. Senate for the first time, drawing stares of disbelief from some veteran legislators.

The resemblance was uncanny. So much so that, for a moment, they imagined that Huey P. Long, firebrand orator, Louisiana's "hillbilly Marxist" and Russell's slain father, had returned from the grave to haunt them.

After all, Huey had worked near-miracles before.

The voice, the gait, the strong wide jaws and full cheeks, those iron black curls combed up in a wave on top of his head—all suggested that the "Kingfish" was back.

Folks at home must have felt the same way. During his campaign for the Senate seat vacated by Sen. John Overton, who died with two years to go in his term, Life magazine reported that Russell's mannerisms were so much like Huey's "many a Redneck thought he was seeing a ghost."

Enemies of the former Louisiana governor and senator—and in his brief lifetime Huey had made a few enemies—foresaw years of more head-butting with his son. For all they knew, he was as ruthless as his father and fought with similar ferocity.

But with time, Russell Billie Long, who took office only weeks after he had reached the required minimum age of 30 to become the youngest man in the Senate, was to surprise them all.

Where Huey was a stubborn, flamboyant rabble-rouser who left a trail of enemies even as he brought reform to his state, Russell relied on grace, brainpower and wit to charm his peers in the Senate and earn respect back home.

Instead of an abrasive, ambitious upstart hoping to pick up where his father left off, here was a smooth, soft-spoken and modest man who advocated a toned-down version of Huey's share-the-wealth vision.

Russell quickly established himself as a moderate Southern Democrat who had a knack for making friends, even among those who disagreed with him. Where his father often left opponents resentful and angry, Russell's style was to leave them weakened with laughter.

For 36 years, Sen. Long, now the second-ranking member of the Senate, has been the dominant force in Louisiana politics. In that sense, he has perpetuated the family tradition started by his father, a Louisiana senator from 1928 until he was assassinated in 1935 at the age of 42.

Along the way, Sen. Russell Long has become one of the most influential lawmakers in the country, serving as chairman of the powerful Finance Committee for 15 years until the Republicans took over the Senate in 1981.

Odds were that, should he have sought another term in 1986, the seat would have been his for the asking.

But in late February, at a time when his campaign staff already had collected more than a half million dollars for his re-election bid, Sen. Long stunned his colleagues and close friends by announcing that his days in the Senate were over.

"The decision wasn't final until I actually announced it," says the 66-year-old senator, seated in his plush and meticulous office on Capitol Hill during a rushed interview squeezed between meetings and lunch. But in fact, it was a decision he had made long ago, during his sixth and last campaign.

"Frankly, that has been my mind-set for the past six years, going back to when I ran last time," he says.

"When I was sweating out there in that hot August sun, I found myself saying, 'Well, one good thing about it is I may not have to do this again.' [Campaigning] is a lot more fun when you're in your 30s, 40s, even your 50s, than it is in your 60s."

Speaking softly in a slow, sorghum Louisiana drawl, the avuncular Southern gentleman sits upright in his chair, addressing each question with his eyes self-consciously riveted on the floor.

He seems ill-at-ease, as if unaccustomed to all the attention and wishing it would go away. Dressed in a stately dark suit, hands neatly folded in his lap, Sen. Long patiently hears out each question before politely giving his answer. When he's finished, he looks up, asking with his eyes if the response is sufficient.

The image is hardly what one would expect from the son of one of the most colorful, flamboyant figures in United States political history; from the former champion of the debate team at Louisiana State University; and from someone who once was described as the "whirlwind president of the student body" in The Gumbo, his college yearbook.

Some have made the mistake of misinterpreting this easy, front-porch-swing manner as slowness and left far behind when he finally shows his hand.

His mouth is fixed in a half-smile, poised to deliver a disarming comment if the con-

versation gets too weighty. His hair, once a mat of coarse black bristle, now lies flat against his head, tame and white.

He takes his time, paying scant attention to his legislative assistant fidgeting in his chair nearby and desperately trying to hold the interview to the allotted half-hour. Unlike his father, who was always racing against time, Russell is in no hurry.

Maybe that's why the announcement, at a hastily arranged press conference Feb. 25, that he would not run again in 1986 caught virtually everyone by surprise. No one thought he would ever leave. And no one could imagine the Senate without him.

Word of his imminent retirement boomed down the halls of Congress. After almost 60 years, the colorful Long era and an exciting chapter in Louisiana politics was coming to an end.

A flood of speculation followed. Was he ill? Did he fear that he would lose another race?

Or, worse yet, was he getting out while the getting was good to avoid implication in the latest Louisiana scandal?

Three days after Sen. Long's announcement, a federal grand jury handed down indictments against Louisiana Gov. Edwin W. Edwards. The charges were that he used his clout to collect \$3 million for himself and his brother from hospital construction deals from 1982 to 1984.

The timing was enough to make anyone wonder if the good senator also had his finger in the pie.

Sen. Long dismisses all those attempts to pin a reason on his departure, insisting it had nothing to do with anything so glamorous or exciting. It was just time to call it quits.

In fact, were it not for a series of delays, he says, he would have made his intentions known a lot sooner, probably shortly after President Reagan's State of the Union address in January.

"I really was thinking about retiring at the end of this term. But once the word got out, the media would've picked it up and I wouldn't have had any decision to make," he says.

So as the fund-raising machinery hummed along, Sen. Long kept silent and waited for an appropriate time to speak out. The best opportunity was just after the Senate was organized, he says, a process that usually takes one meeting. "But for the first time in 36 years, bipartisan bickering delayed that for almost six weeks."

Then, on Jan. 20, when he was preparing to make the announcement, Rep. Gillis W. Long, his distant cousin, died just as he was beginning his eighth term in Congress. And later, when Gillis' wife Cathy announced that she would run for her husband's vacated seat, Sen. Long says, "I didn't want to upstage her . . . so I postponed it again."

Four members of his family died while in office: his father, Huey, uncle Earl, three-time governor of Louisiana; cousin Gillis; and another uncle, George Long, who served in the House of Representatives from 1953 to 1958.

"If I'm fortunate I might live a long life," says the senator. "And if you do live a long life, in my judgment, you should retire in the Senate rather than die in it."

After almost four decades in office, no one understands the country's complicated tax laws, or for that matter, the government itself better than Sen. Long, say those who worked with him.

"He knows more about the tax code than all the rest of us put together," said Sen.

Robert Dole, R-Kan., who replaced Sen. Long as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee in 1981.

"I doubt if you could measure his contribution. If you could go back and look at all the things that have his fingerprints on them, you'd have a book. . . He's always looking for solutions, not problems."

For someone who has been in office as long as he—he is second in seniority to Mississippi Democrat John Stennis, 83—Sen. Long has had few legislative initiatives, preferring instead to focus his attention on projects dear to him.

Those that stand out are the voluntary tax write-off provision that allows taxpayers to donate \$1 to presidential campaigns; the earned income tax credit, which benefits the working poor; and a tax credit program for companies that offer employees stock ownership plans.

Sen. Long opposed early civil rights legislation but eventually reversed his position to support the Voting Rights Act in 1981. He helped defeat President Nixon's Family Assistance Plan, which he considers his greatest legislative coup.

"He's a populist at heart," said Sen. Dole. But the Louisiana senator has always stopped short of pursuing his father's famous "share the wealth" crusade.

Also unlike his father, who terrified the business community and especially Louisiana's oil and gas industries with his Dixie socialism, Russell Long was their advocate. What was good for the industry was good for Louisiana, he figured.

As chairman of the Finance Committee, Sen. Long ruled with a velvet glove, coaxing rather than forcing votes from a supply of friends he made on the strength of his personality and his skill.

"He had good antennae," said Sen. Dole. "He knew when to strike and when to retreat."

Sen. Lloyd Bentsen, a Texas Democrat who has been on the committee for 12 years, said Sen. Long has had an unparalleled sense of fairness as chairman. "He didn't bruise people."

Another Finance Committee member said that, with regard to Senate procedure, the Louisiana senator had "an innate ability to sense when an amendment should be offered, when you should talk and when you should sit down. He senses that chemistry as keenly as any person I've had the opportunity of serving with."

His political career has not been without its dark moments, though. Elected whip in 1965, Sen. Long lost the job to Sen. Edward Kennedy four years later. Senate Democrats thought he had handled the job poorly, and that he was too willing to delay Senate business. Some of his colleagues blamed it on alcohol.

However, Bob Hunter, his administrative assistant for 20 years, flatly denied that the senator ever had a drinking problem. "I never at any time saw anything that would lead me to believe in any way shape or form that Russell Long had a drinking problem. And I was with him longer than anyone else," he said.

When newly elected President Jimmy Carter was preparing to take office, as one story goes, he commented on how he was looking forward to coming to Washington to run things. "But," he said, "when I got here I found that Russell Long was already running them."

More memorable than his wisdom, though, is the senator's legendary wit, and the combination of the two can quickly take

the steam out of any argument. Sen. Long is known for his ability to digest hundreds of pages of complicated tax law and point out the essence in a few brief sentences. More often than not, his explanations come out in pithy, down-home observations or parables that show not only a firm grasp of the subject matter, but also of human nature.

Once, after the committee was confronted with baffling testimony on a proposed tax depreciation schedule, Sen. Long quipped, "Well, if you can't explain it off the back of a pickup truck, it ain't worth having."

Born of a storybook character father, raised in a political maelstrom and taunted by neighborhood kids because of things they heard their fathers say about his, Russell nonetheless emerged with an even temperament and a wry, self-effacing sense of humor.

Even as a child growing up in Shreveport, he showed an appreciation for simple pleasures and could find amusement in the most mundane of circumstances, his sister recalled.

"He could see humor in things so that sometimes you might not even know what he was thinking about," said Rose Long McFarland, who now lives in Colorado. "He sees humor in little things that not everyone can see it in. I think he can just find pleasure in the world around him."

"Our father had a marvelous sense of humor. Russell has some of that, but it's a more quiet, introspective kind." As a child he used to like to settle in a chair off by himself. "He'd just sit there, think and musing to himself, thinking about whatever it was, then sometimes just burst out in a little chuckle."

"He has some of Huey's flamboyance," said Mrs. McFarland, "but then he has the gentle way that came from our mother. He has the better part of both."

Sen. Long may be a big-time politician on Capitol Hill, but his heart has never left the banks of the Mississippi River, Louisiana's crawfish bakes or his friends back home.

"Of course, in Washington, they call everybody senator," said Mrs. McFarland. "Most people in Louisiana just call him Russell."

Jimmy Davis, governor of Louisiana from 1944 to 1948 and again from 1960 to 1964, used to live across the street from the Longs after the family moved from Shreveport to Baton Rouge. He remembers taking walks with Huey Long, and he vividly recalls the sadness throughout the state when the "Kingfish" was gunned down in front of the elevator in the capitol building.

In fact, it was Huey who had talked Mr. Davis into getting into politics, he said.

Mr. Davis said he's a little too old ("looking back at 80 and heading for 90") to say he was a childhood friend of Russell. It was later, when both were active in politics, that they became close. Russell was "easier, a little smoother than his father," Mr. Davis recalled. "He was always kind and compassionate even to those who disagreed with him."

The class of 1942 at Louisiana State University started about 140 strong, but with natural attrition was whittled to about 25 by year's end. But it yielded some of the most influential people in the state.

One of those, E. Gordon West, who was appointed U.S. District Judge by President John Kennedy in 1961, was Russell Long's law partner for two years before he was elected to the Senate.

Their friendship began not in school, but in the Navy, after the judge-to-be went to a

movie aboard a ship in the Mediterranean and, by coincidence, took a seat beside his former classmate. Neither had known that the other was in the area.

Judge West, now semiretired and looking stately with a full head of white hair, remembers being awakened on several occasions at 2 in the morning by his industrious law partner, who had gone to the office "to flesh out" an idea.

"Russell's a rather complex person," he said. "When you're talking to him, he's probably three or four jumps ahead of you. Sometimes I thought he had missed the point, but then when I caught up with him I saw he'd skipped the three or four inconsequential steps in between."

Alvin B. Rubin, valedictorian of the class of '42 and now a federal appeals court judge in Baton Rouge, has his office on the 24th floor of one of the tallest buildings in Baton Rouge. A picture window offers a grand view of the Mississippi River and the old state capitol Mark Twain once called a "Moorish monstrosity."

Judge Rubin said that he and Sen. Long have been good friends for 45 years. He remembers Russell, who was third in his class, as a very "unassuming, hard-working young man" and an "intellectual leader" at school.

Aside from his family history and involvement in student politics, Russell was best known as a formidable debater, Judge Rubin said. Once, when LSU was going to debate a team from Oxford, Russell was chosen to represent the school along with a graduate student named Hubert Humphrey.

The younger Mr. Long had disappointed a lot of his father's staunch supporters, said Mr. Gill. Perhaps it was his approach, which was "more sensible" than Huey's. "He worked for everybody," he said. "There was no hatred."

A clerk in a Baton Rouge jewelry store described herself as a senior citizen and a long-time Long supporter. "I don't know Russell personally, but I know what he's done," she said, citing a social security cost-of-living raise that Russell helped push through. He has been as effective as his father, she said, but "not in as loud a way."

About a week before he announced his retirement, and after he had done some reflecting at his retreat in the mountains, Sen. Long paid a visit to his old friend Buddy Gill in Baton Rouge. Their conversation on the back porch was Mr. Gill's first indication that the senator was thinking of leaving the hectic political life.

"He came to my house, sat there on the patio, looked at me and told me how comfortable I looked," said Mr. Gill, who is retired. "I told him I was. I told him now that I'm retired, I do what I want to do. Then he said next time he comes he's going to bring his golf clubs."

It'll take some willpower to stay out of politics for a while, says Sen. Long, shifting in the leather chair in his Senate office. Of course he'll still maintain an interest in government and plans to stay somewhat involved.

"But, at least for the first year, I hope to resist some of that and pay more attention to my private affairs."

Like fishing. "I haven't found time to fish in years, and I'd like to be fair at it. There are plenty of places to fish in Louisiana."

And golf, with his wife, Carolyn. "I hope that I can find time to get to be not a good golfer, but an adequate golfer—to break 100, perhaps," he says with a chuckle.

When he retires he will have been in the Senate 38 years, and "that's a lot of time to work any job," he says.

Looking back at his career, he attributes his success to the differences, not the similarities, between himself and his father. The way he sees it, Huey was a "revolutionary" and he an "evolutionary."

As the morning turns to afternoon and then runs into another appointment, Sen. Long stands and pulls a crinkle out of his suit. Walking toward the door, he flashes a grin. You may think so, he says, but you haven't heard the last of the Louisiana Longs.

It's not really the end. There'll be others to appear on the scene in due course. Not necessarily my children or my grandchildren. But I have a lot of relatives in Louisiana who have been bit by the political bug. You'll be hearing from them."

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Chair.

ISRAEL SHOULD STOP ITS MASSIVE SALE OF MILITARY WEAPONS TO SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of this Nation's firmest friends and strongest allies in the world is the little country of Israel. In that keg of dynamite known as the Middle East, the Israelis stand out as a truly unique island of democracy and as a firm and consistent supporter of the United States. Israel is precisely the kind of friend this country values because it is no wilting violet. It is no wimp, no shrinking dependent. Indeed, it is a nation whose military force is hard as nails. Its soldiers are trained, smart, motivated, superbly led. Again and again, they have been tried by superior forces—superior in number, in economic strength, and in military hardware. But the Israelis have repeatedly won military victories in defense of their homeland.

Now, Mr. President, let us be frank about this. Israel has a very strong political home base right here in the United States. The Jewish population in America is relatively small, less than 3 percent, but, because of the extraordinary level of its education, its economic achievements and its vigorous political activity, it has earned a special respect with every thoughtful person who is active in American politics. And it provides an alert and aggressive base for support of Israel in both political parties, in the press, in the Congress, and in every administration. As a senior U.S. Senator I have been among those who have been convinced that vigorous economic and military support for Israel is in our clear national interest.

Mr. President, all of what I have just said is why I am so concerned about the substance of a story that appeared

on Friday, March 22, in the Washington Post, headlined: Israeli Economy Said To Depend Heavily on Export of Weapons.

In an article written by Daniel Southerland, the Post reports that little Israel may be selling over a billion dollars in military weapons. The report is based on a study by Aharon Klieman of Tel Aviv University. Mr. Klieman estimates that arms sales may account for as much as a quarter of Israel's industrial exports. In relation to its size, Israel has become an astonishing leader in the export of weapons.

The 1982 statistical computations of the U.S. Arms Control Agency places Israel fifth in the world in the proportion of its exports that are military sales. Only North Korea, the Soviet Union, Romania, and Egypt have a higher percentage of their exports in military weapons. Israel's military weapon exports constitute 6.9 percent of its total exports, compared to a 4.5 percent ratio for the United States.

Most troubling is the destination of Israel's arms exports. From one-third to one-half of Israel's arms exports go to Latin America. But the big shocker is that this Washington Post report estimates that 35 percent of Israel's exports have gone to South Africa in recent years!

Mr. President, in view of our own protests against South African apartheid and our proposed restraint of our trade with South Africa—and our present policy of a virtual ban on U.S. military weapons exports to South Africa—this sale by Israel of \$350 million in weapons to South Africa raises some very serious questions about Israel, our close friend and ally. What would be the reaction in this body if the United States were selling \$350 million in weapons to South Africa? There would be outrage. There would be picketing. And there would be swift and sure action by the Congress to stop it.

Mr. President, all of us know that Israel is in desperate economic straits. It has to pour most of its resources into defense. Virtually all of its able-bodied manpower, except for the elderly, serves on active military duty or in the reserve. Largely because of this necessary concentration on military defense, it suffers a 100-percent annual rate of inflation, one of the worst inflation rates in the world. Clearly, it must have foreign exchange. Arms sales provides that foreign exchange. And of course the Israel armament industry does something else: It assures the country of the production of ample military weapons at low cost because the billion-dollar arms export program permits big economies of scale in Israel's arms production.

Sure, it's a brutal world out there, Mr. President, but at a time when

South Africa is imposing its cruel apartheid system on the 70 percent of its citizens who are black, at a time when South African police are shooting down unarmed innocent black citizens who are guilty of nothing except attending a funeral for their deceased brethren, can Israel really justify selling them \$350 million worth of military weapons? The citizens of Israel, this gallant country, our firm ally, should think long and hard about that one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post of Friday, March 22, that reports Israel's export of military weapons be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1985]
ISRAELI ECONOMY SAID TO DEPEND HEAVILY
ON EXPORT OF WEAPONS
OVER \$1 BILLION IN SALES POSSIBLE
(By Daniel Southerland)

Overseas arms sales have become a central component of Israel's foreign relations and one on which its economy is now heavily and perhaps dangerously dependent, according to an Israeli expert.

Aharon Klieman of Tel Aviv University estimates that weapons sales now account for as much as a quarter of Israel's industrial exports. The old image of a sunny Israel exporting oranges has been supplemented, if not superseded, by that of a small nation that can provide more bang for the buck. Alongside the oranges, an equally appropriate symbol for today's Israeli exports might be the Uzi submachine gun or the Gabriel sea-to-sea missile.

Klieman, a political scientist, said the dependence on arms sales virtually has been imposed on Israel and, until recently at least, has served Israeli interests well. But in an interview, he argued that the Israelis now may be reaching the limit of their growth as arms exporters and ought to re-evaluate what has been a largely uncoordinated effort. He contended that growing competition among arms producers for markets and the unavailability of some of Israel's debt-ridden weapons purchasers are likely to limit further arms exports.

Klieman pointed to Brazil as a competing arms exporter that holds advantages over Israel. Supported by major natural resources and cheap labor, Brazil can sell to the world's leading arms purchasers, the Arab nations of the Middle East, a market denied to Israel.

Despite its disadvantages, Israel may be exporting more than \$1 billion worth of arms each year, according to Klieman. Each of the two government-controlled defense manufacturers admits to marketing its products to more than 40 foreign nations. Klieman estimated the total number of Israeli arms clients to be close to 50, an impressive figure when one compares it with the 67 countries that purchase arms from the United States and 28 known to buy weapons from the Soviet Union.

A total of 112 Israeli industries are involved in the arms sales effort. They have mastered the most sophisticated technologies, including microelectronics and a new generation of precision-guided "smart weapons."

As a visiting professor at Georgetown University, Klieman has spent much of the past year writing what might be described as the first comprehensive book on Israeli arms sales. An American-born Israeli citizen, he previously wrote on the subject as an associate of the Jaffee Center for Strategic Studies at Tel Aviv University. His book is to be published in June by Pergamon-Brassey's under the title "Israel's Global Reach: Arms Sales as Diplomacy."

Working from unclassified, public materials and interviews with defense industry leaders and specialists, Klieman concludes that it may be time for Israel to rein in its arms exports. According to various estimates, those exports currently constitute between a fifth and a third of the country's total industrial exports.

In his book, Klieman argues that military sales come close to dominating Israel's foreign trade and certainly its industrial exports.

"Even if effectively restricted to no more than one-quarter of industrial exports, the sale of arms, acknowledged to be one of the more unstable and unpredictable areas of international commerce, would in Israeli terms be too salient," Klieman writes.

"A sudden drop in sales, due perhaps to being edged out by other sellers or possibly because a good customer can no longer afford additional purchases, has no use for them or is itself manufacturing comparable items, would introduce profound shocks in already shaky economy."

Klieman says he sees signs that Prime Minister Shimon Peres is going to pursue a more cautious arms sales policy, shying away, for example, from further entanglements with Central American nations.

Peres has said that Israel no longer sells any military equipment to Iran. Following the 1979-80 hostage crisis, Israel was reported to have sold \$25 million worth of spare parts and other items to the Iranians.

Klieman calls for greater coordination of arms sales within the Israeli government. He says there is no permanent unit charged with considering the political implications and economic consequences of weapons sales. He adds that the Israeli defense industry now may be aiming too high in attempting to sell tanks and fighter planes in the face of powerful competition. He contends that Israel needs to reach an understanding on arms sales with the United States, which is both a market and a competitor for Israel's arms sales.

Klieman recommends that Israel further develop its most advanced technologies and cultivate more arms trade with the members of NATO.

"At a time of unprecedented American sensitivity to the financial burden of supporting Israel, . . . it is hard to anticipate an enthusiastic reception for defense sales contracts in the U.S. market by Israel," Klieman writes.

"Such prospects will be poor unless a skillful political and public relations campaign is waged to present Israeli defense sales in a positive light," he says.

Klieman argues that Israeli success in selling its military wares ought to make it less dependent on American grants and loans. In addition, he says that Israel's innovations and its refinements of American weapons represent savings for the U.S. government.

According to Klieman, Israel's main market is Third World nations. As he puts it, Israel offers them a "cost effective alternative" in the form of cheap, highly mobile, and easily operable weapons.

When it comes to poor nations that cannot afford to buy new and expensive weapons, the Israelis have the answer. They are adept at modernizing old equipment. Israel is reported, for example, to have "updated" 15 Mirage-55 fighter planes for Colombia.

The Israelis also refurbish old Soviet equipment. Having captured large quantities of Soviet weapons, the Israelis are now considered the second largest exporters of Soviet arms. In 1982, the subject of sales of Soviet-built equipment is said to have arisen in talks between Israel and Zaire.

In terms of total arms exports, Israel is not among the biggest exporters in the world. It probably ranks around 15th or 16th, Klieberman says, lagging far behind such big exporters as the Soviet Union, the United States and France. But when it comes to arms exports in relation to its total in exports, Israel has one of the highest ratings in the world, reflecting its economic dependence on this single sector.

In 1982, statistical computations by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency placed Israel fifth in this category, with the nation's military sales estimated at 6.9 percent of its total exports, based only upon known or verified transfers of arms. This figure was exceeded only by those of Egypt with 9.3 percent, Romania with 9.5 percent, the Soviet Union with 12.5 percent, and—in all probability—North Korea with 13.2 percent in 1976. The United States' military sales were estimated at 4.5 percent of its total exports.

Although accurate statistics are hard to come by, it appears that South Africa has been the leading purchaser of arms from Israel, acquiring as many as 35 percent of the nation's arms exports in recent years. Israeli sales to South Africa have included gunboats and Gabriel missiles.

Latin American nations are reported to buy anywhere from a third to half of Israel's arms exports. Among those nations, Argentina is probably the largest client, having purchased heavily from Israel before the Falklands war.

The Israelis were at one point the largest infantry equipment suppliers to El Salvador and Guatemala. They are reported to have conducted intelligence training in Guatemala and Costa Rica and to have offered Central American nations stocks of arms captured in Lebanon at low cost.

It is no incident that the Israeli directory of defense industries and their products is published in two editions—one in English and one in Spanish.

[Mr. McCONNELL assumed the chair.]

HOW AND WHY STAR WARS WILL DESTROY ARMS CONTROL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Suppose the anti-missile technology—star wars—works perfectly, as Secretary Weinberger insists it will. What will it do? Will it prevent an ICBM attack on the United States? If so, what would become of the prime Russian deterrent to an American attack? Much of its deterrent capability—not all of it but much of it—would fade away. But unless the Russians also had the star wars technology, the American deterrent would remain intact. Then what happens? Since the early 1950's, when the U.S.S.R. developed its nuclear arsenal,

the superpowers have been in rough nuclear balance. Each superpower has known that the other superpower fully realizes the other side's capability to retaliate in response to an attack is so devastating, so sure to destroy the other, that neither superpower will ever initiate such a strike. For more than 30 years—ever since both powers developed their own massive retaliatory powers—that balance, that standoff, has kept the peace. Does it give perfect assurance that the Russians will never initiate a nuclear preemptive strike? No. Is it likely as the nuclear arms race continues that one side or the other will make a technological breakthrough which will eventually persuade the leadership of that superpower that they have a temporary nuclear advantage that will enable them to end the nuclear threat of the other superpower? Yes. And given enough time and the potential of nuclear weapons research, such a technological breakthrough eventually is probable, in fact, highly probable unless we end the arms race.

Isn't it likely that the Russians regard our antimissile or star wars program as exactly this kind of a potential breakthrough? After all, if this star wars system does everything its principal advocate, Secretary of Defense Weinberger, says it will do, it will indeed give the United States exactly the kind of decisive nuclear weapons advantage that could destroy the Soviet deterrent.

In doing so, in the eyes of the Russians, wouldn't this terminate the nuclear balance that has kept the peace between the world's two great military powers for the past 30 years? How do we restore that balance? Secretary Weinberger says that we restore the balance by handing the technology over to the Russians, lock, stock, and barrel. The Russians could then produce and deploy their own antimissile program. Is it possible that such a startling and astonishingly generous proposal could serve American interests? Usually, when the Defense Department has said that we would make the antimissile technology available to the Soviets, they have added a critical qualification. They would insist on a quid pro quo. When General Abrahamson, who heads the program, last testified before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee he emphasized that quid pro quo. The Russians would get the star wars technology only if they agreed to a mutual and verifiable treaty to limit the production and deployment of offensive missiles so that neither superpower could simply nullify the antimissile defense by building enough offensive missiles to overwhelm the antimissile defense, and by improving the missiles so they can penetrate the defense.

Mr. President, this Senator is concerned that the administration is

pushing the Congress into a trap that will have the following painful consequences: First, it will cost this country a trillion dollars or more. Second, it will destroy arms control. It will do so by making the satellites on which arms control critically depend for verification easily and certainly vulnerable. Third, it will not win an offensive missile limitation agreement from the Soviet Union even if we offer the technology to the U.S.S.R. The Russians would not buy such an agreement because three-quarters of the Soviet deterrent is on land-based ICBM's, whereas only one-quarter of the U.S. deterrent is in land-based ICBM's. The antimissile system will only work against land-based ICBM's.

So, what follows? Suppose both sides were to deploy the antimissile system. What is the result? The Soviets would find three-quarters of their deterrent compromised. We would find only one-quarter of our deterrent in any jeopardy. As an American, of course, I would like that kind of an agreement. But would the Russians? What do you think? What happens if the Russians accept such a treaty? They agree to limit any further land-based missile deployment. They agree not to harden the skins of their ICBM's. They agree not to use decoys. So they agree to assure us that three-fourths of their deterrent will be greatly diminished in retaliatory power. In return, we make the same agreement. We agree to limit our ICBM land-based force. We agree not to harden the skins or use decoys. So we lose most of the deterrent force of our land-based ICBM's. But so what? We only have one-quarter of our deterrent land based and incapacitated. The Soviets would have three-fourths of their deterrent land based and incapacitated. Does anyone really expect the Soviet Union to agree to such a deal, even if we do give them our multibillion dollar technology as a gift? Of course not, and the administration knows it. So why does the administration go through this act of proposing to give the Russians our immensely expensive antimissile nuclear technology? Because the administration knows it can attach conditions that the Soviets will reject out of hand. And once again, the Reagan administration can argue that it wants to negotiate arms control but the Soviets stubbornly refuse to agree in spite of the spectacularly generous quality of the offer. And when the Russians refuse to accept the star wars technology and we push ahead with star wars, what will the Russians do? They will do precisely what Dr. Hans Bethe, who probably knows more about nuclear weapons than any man alive, says they will do. They will double or triple their offensive missiles. They harden the skin of their missiles so our antimissile cannot stop them, and

they will prepare to fill the skies with 10 decoys for every missile so they can "use up" the antimissile defense. The trillion dollar antimissile program will turn out to have been totally useless and a trillion dollar golden fleece. The nuclear arms race will march on, more and more out of control. Arms control will be dead. Why will arms control die? Because the star wars technology will make the satellites sitting ducks. Russian missiles will not be vulnerable to the star wars technology. The satellites essential for arms control verification will be the sure and certain victim of our star wars arms race.

WHERE THE REAGAN FISCAL POLICY IS TAKING AMERICA

Mr. PROXMIRE. How will history view President Ronald Reagan? Here is a President who has won two smashing landslide elections. He has succeeded in stopping, at least temporarily and maybe permanently, a steady 50-year increase in Federal spending for a variety of purposes, including housing, health, education, environmental protection, financial assistance to State and local government. On the other hand, he has sharply increased spending for military and foreign aid purposes. He has succeeded in reducing taxes on upper-income Americans, the personal income tax, and increasing taxes paid by low- and moderate-income persons, the Social Security payroll tax. He tried and failed to change the laws regarding abortion and prayer in the schools. He has opposed agreement with the Russians on nuclear arms limitation—an agreement that relies almost exclusively on Presidential negotiations.

By far, his most significant innovation is military. He supports star wars, a radical, highly controversial, immensely expensive and unworkable new technology designed to defend against a possible nuclear ICBM attack by the U.S.S.R. How does all this add up? What will Americans think of the Reagan administration 10 years or 50 years from now? If, as seems likely—if not certain—we have endured through the next 10 or 50 years, so there is still an American Nation surviving and able to assess the Reagan administration, here is my guess on how they will consider the Reagan administration. Here is a report from April 1 in the year 2035:

The Reagan years were the most grossly irresponsible fiscal years in the history of the country. Why? Because those were the years the crushing Federal debt began. Ironically the explosion of the national debt that undermined the U.S. economy was accompanied by a transparent patina of criticism by President Reagan and his supporters in the administration and the press of the wasteful spending prac-

tices of previous administrations and against his congressional opposition. President Reagan and his administration drove the Federal deficit to a level that pushed it out of Congress' control. Here is how it happened: In the first 4 years of the Reagan administration, in spite of the President's anti-spending posture, the Congress maintained almost precisely the same rate of increase in Federal spending as its predecessors. The Reagan administration simply shifted the priorities. His administration held down spending for social services but it transferred the savings from reduced spending for social services into spending for military programs.

The critical fiscal change took place in the tax or revenue side of the ledger. President Reagan called for and won a very sharp reduction in the progressive income tax. Result: the overall Federal budget ran far and away the biggest deficits in the history of America. Fifty years ago, back in 1935, when these mammoth deficits were just beginning, some Senators proposed to hold down military as well as domestic spending. The President temporarily relented from his military buildup and negotiated a \$50 billion overall reduction in the current services budget, which was expected to reduce the deficit from its \$220 billion deficit in 1935 down to \$170 billion in 1936. But the sharp reduction in the deficits slowed the economy. Unemployment rose. Tax revenues fell. Some Members of the Congress called for an even stiffer battle against the deficit. They asked for further spending cuts and tax increases. Others called on the President and the Congress to dig in and hold the line. The 1936 elections were coming up. So, the President made an unsurprising political decision. He called on a willing Congress to get the economy moving again. They did. They passed a combination tax cut and an across the board increase in both domestic and military spending.

Under a new Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, monetary policy eased up. The economy regained its momentum with the stimulative combination of a \$300 billion deficit and an easier monetary policy. The Reagan administration's brief and frightening flirtation into fiscal responsibility in 1985 taught future Presidents a lesson they did not forget for the next 15 years. Despite misgivings the Congress even proceeded with the multitrillion dollar star wars program. In 1988 it added 1,000 additional MX missiles armed with 10,000 nuclear warheads. The United States also vigorously stepped up its conventional armor of ships, tanks, and planes. The President, the Congress and much of the American public became convinced that only big and steadily increasing deficits could keep the economy

moving. In 1988, the deficit exceeded a half trillion dollars. In 1995, the country had its first \$2 trillion deficit. That year, the national debt climbed to \$10 trillion. Inflation raced to an annual rate of 25 percent. The Treasury bill rate averaged 20 percent. Interest on the national debt at \$2 trillion a year exceeded all other costs of the Federal Government combined.

Finally, in the year 2000, inflation reached 100 percent. The Federal Government devalued the dollar, laid off half its employees, tripled its taxation, and stopped the arms race by negotiating a nuclear freeze with the U.S.S.R. America then suffered 25 years of high unemployment before it moved to a 30-hour workweek in 2025.

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES MARKUP DATE FOR GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have argued time and again that the time to act on the Genocide Convention is right now. And the slow pace of the Senate schedule—we were only in session 2 days last week—demonstrates that point clearly.

But I have been delighted to learn that, at long last, there is progress. The Foreign Relations Committee has announced April 23 as the markup date for the Genocide Convention.

That is good news and the committee chairman and ranking minority member are to be congratulated on reaching an agreement for committee action.

It is far from clear whether committee action will be completed on that date, however. The tactics of opponents have always centered on delay and the possibility is there, under the committee's rules, for requesting a 1-week delay to review any proposal that is put forward.

But I hope the committee will follow its own action of just 6 months ago. Then, the committee reported the Genocide Convention promptly with three understandings and one declaration and it is my fervent hope that they will report the Genocide Convention once again in just that format.

Nevertheless, the administration's flip-flop on an article IX reservation has not co-opted the opponents as the administration may have hoped. Instead, it has fueled the fire for more understandings and so-called clarifications to the Convention. Indeed, at the committee's last hearing, a list of eight amendments was circulated which would not only gut the Convention but would completely restate American treaty practice of the last 30 years. What Senator Bricker couldn't succeed in doing—in a straightforward manner in an up-or-down vote on the Senate floor—the Genocide Conven-

tion's opponents are attempting to do by a backdoor "clarification" to the treaty.

Opponents are attempting to steamroll the committee members into believing that these amendments are a necessary "price" for securing an opportunity to debate the Genocide Convention on the Senate floor. Nothing could be further from the truth.

For every amendment offered by opponents, for every clarification proposed, there are a dozen waiting in the wings. While insisting that they support the treaty but it merely needs to be "improved;" the opponents know full well that you cannot change the text of a multilateral treaty—particularly one that has been ratified by 96 nations—and expect our signature to have any validity under international law.

But the arena in which to debate all of these "helpful" proposals is the Senate floor. Each and every one of these issues will be debated fully on the Senate floor, regardless of the committee's decision, so there is no need to prolong the fight by debating them twice.

I cannot expect that opponents would let any of these amendments slip by without a debate and I welcome it. I am convinced that when the Members of this body have an opportunity to review the arguments in full, that this Chamber will move promptly to ratify the Genocide Convention without crippling amendments.

The case for the Convention is strong and it will withstand these assaults. But the time to open debate is now. The time for delay is long since gone.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for morning business.

CHILD ABUSE AWARENESS MONTH

TEACHING KIDS WHAT TO LOOK FOR AND WHAT TO DO IF IT HAPPENS TO THEM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, today marks the beginning of Child Abuse Awareness Month; a time for our Nation to give special consideration to the problems of child abuse and its damaging effects on our society.

The statistics involving child abuse incidents are frightening. One expert says that as many as 10,000 children are severely battered each year, at least 50,000 to 70,000 are sexually abused, 100,000 are emotionally neglected, and another 100,000 are physically, morally, and educationally neglected. The actual numbers of child abuse and neglect cases are difficult to ascertain because of the necessity of relying on reporting by hospitals, the police, or family members. Most re-

searchers agree that studies and surveys underestimate the true number of incidents. Statistics further show that many abused children grow up to be abusers, and many along the way are likely to become involved in criminal acts.

For too long, our society has labeled this subject taboo, and for too long, we, as parents, family members, and citizens have turned our backs on the victims—the many thousands of children who are frightened and confused about what to do once it happens to them.

Mr. President, I stand before this body to share what I have learned of an important cooperative effort underway in this country. On February 17 of this year, eight major newspapers published a four-page supplement with a critical message on child abuse to children; what to look for and what to do if it happens to them.

In the form of a comic strip, using the popular figures of "Spider-Man and Power Pack," the delicate issues of child abuse and neglect were masterfully analyzed in a way that children could understand. The response to the supplements has been moving. Hundreds of letters from formerly abused children and thoughtful parents, to teachers and law enforcement officials, have poured in to the groups that sponsored and organized the publishing. I would like to share with my colleagues excerpts from some of these many letters.

In all, 6.6 million copies of the supplement were distributed on that day in the eight newspapers. Special thanks should go to the newspapers that allowed the supplement to run in their editions: the Chicago Tribune, the Boston Globe, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Des Moines Register, the Detroit Free Press, the Kansas City Star, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The organizations behind the scenes that made up their historic cooperative effort happen, the Marvel Comics Groups, the National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse, and the McArthur Foundation, which funded the supplements, should also be commended.

Mr. President, this incredible effort to educate millions of American families and open the door to parent-child discussions need not end now. The Marvel Comics Group has agreed to provide us with copies of this comic strip so that every Member of Congress can have the opportunity to see firsthand this important message. They are being delivered to the offices as I speak.

I want to urge my colleagues in both Houses to do everything within their power to encourage the distribution of this comic strip in their home states. It is a special comic strip, with a spe-

cial message that speaks to the hearts and minds of all ages.

There are many steps that we, as a Nation, must take to bring the disease of child abuse under control. The widespread distribution of publications, like this comic strip, that are designed to draw attention to this problem and offer advice to children and parents on how to handle it, is one of these important steps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letters to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1985.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE,
Chicago, IL.

To whom it may concern:

This Sunday I read the Spiderman supplement in the Chicago Tribune; I had to write to tell you what I thought about it.

When I was a kid I read a lot of comics. My nickel allowance would buy either a candy bar or two comic books; I usually went for the comic books. And they didn't even stunt my intellectual growth, as so many adults believed in those days—now I'm getting a PhD. But in those days a lot of things were different, and one of them was that no one but no one ever talked about things like child abuse.

I was abused by my father for nearly 17 years. He said he'd kill me if I ever told anyone. I finally got up the nerve to tell my mother, who said I must be lying. I never told anyone else about it again until I saw a psychiatrist in my twenties. How I wish that one of those many comic books I read had had a story like this in them! I might have had the bravery to tell others, to tell until someone did believe me.

I am very glad that Marvel has done this story, and that nowadays people do talk about this, that they are bringing it out into the open. Years after the fact I found out that I was not alone, that many friends of mine had been abused and either had been afraid to tell or had been accused of lying. When I read this comic it made me want to cry—not because it made me sad, but because it made me hopeful. If other kids could be saved from such horrifying and crushing guilt, it would be a very good thing. Putting it into a comic book is a very good idea; for a lot of kids, comic books are more than entertainment—they are friends.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

INSTRUCTOR AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY.

FEBRUARY 28, 1985.

DEAR STAN LEE, I really enjoyed your special addition on sexual abuse. I think it will encourage kids to tell adults that they are being sexually abused. I hope to grow up and be a cartoonist like you someday.

Sincerely,

10 YEAR OLD BOY.

FEBRUARY 28, 1985.

DEAR SIR/MA'AM, I am currently a nursing student taking my psychiatric nursing course. During a women's group therapy session I attended, the topic of sexual abuse was brought up by the therapist. I knew the statistics on sexual abuse were rising, but to my surprise, all fourteen women in the

group reported being sexually abused at one time or another between the ages of six to eighteen years old. Once one member of the group told her painful experience, the others followed. Needless, to say, a lot of pain, anger, frustration and tears were released.

I want to thank you for your part in presenting that wonderful comic strip placed in the Chicago Tribune. I hope it helps children and adults talk about their feelings and fears about this problem. The women in my group said that the hardest part was telling someone about it. I hope children found a way to do that through the comic strip. I also want to thank you for the list of agencies to contact for information and help. The public needed that. I was very glad I read last Sunday's Chicago Tribune.

NURSING STUDENT.

To Whom It May Concern, your supplement on Child Abuse which appeared in Sunday's Tribune is to be commended.

I think it is wonderful to see the media aiding in informing and educating today's children. Child abuse is a reality and it truly exists in our world.

There are, I'm sure, a great number of frightened victims out there. And, if your supplement even touches a handful, it will have done a great deal. Thanks for reaching out to them and giving them courage to come forward, and also, a sense of understanding. It's important for these children to be aware of the fact that they're not alone and that they're not bad!

I am confident that your supplement will do its intended job.

It really impressed me to see the open arms of help which you are offering.

Bravo to you!

WOMAN IN ILLINOIS.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE,
Chicago, IL.

Good Morning!

Recently I had the pleasure of reading the Spider-Man and Power Pack comic strip presented in the Chicago Tribune newspaper dealing with child abuse. I found this article to be very informative and a good way of relating to possible abused children.

With more and more child abuse and neglect cases being reported every day, I would like to be able to have some pamphlets on hand for the children and/or their parents to refer to. Do you have any type of information pamphlets on child abuse or neglect that can be presented to the public? If so, I am interested in obtaining several copies for our Department.

Any information you can relay to me will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully,

JUVENILE OFFICER IN INDIANA.

FEBRUARY 28, 1985.

To Whom It May Concern:

Congratulations and much appreciation on a job well done. I am very impressed with the Spiderman insert on child sexual abuse. I have a four-year-old daughter to whom I intend to read it to as soon as we can have a quiet time. She goes to pre-school and has gotten some instruction about avoiding strangers and saying "no" already. There was also a good episode on "Richard Pryor's Place" about an abused girl that we watched together. I'm sure the comic will reinforce the messages.

I think it's wonderful that the media is helping along the work that your organiza-

tion is doing. I feel there can't be too much information, and constructive educational vehicles such as the Spiderman Comic are very important. As a parent I depend on them because I need to be instructed first, and only then can I instruct my child. And for the unfortunate children who don't have the parent who cares, the programs and comics that speak directly to them are invaluable. As the comic does.

I'd like to see more comics like this one. Maybe one in comic book form to be made available to schools, churches, etc. The honesty and positiveness were very impressive, thanks to everyone for caring.

In addition to being moved to writing this letter I also was moved to tears while reading the comic. And after, out of gratitude and also sadness that our world is one where this sort of thing is needed.

Sincerely,

MOTHER OF 4-YEAR OLD IN ILLINOIS.

MANCHESTER, MO.

February 28, 1985.

DEAR SIR: My children and I just finished reading your Spiderman supplement in the St. Louis Post Dispatch. You took a very difficult subject and gave us a way to make it understandable, even to young children.

It is so hard as a parent to know how to bring this tragic problem to your children's attention. Your supplement gave us a great starting point that led to a lot of discussion, and questions from my children. I applaud your supplement and thank you for your tremendous help.

Sincerely,

MOTHER IN MISSOURI.

FEBRUARY 28, 1985.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE,
Chicago, IL.

DEAR COMMITTEE, I would like to add my appreciation to that of many other parents, I'm sure, for featuring the Spiderman comic in February's Sunday the 17th edition of the "Chicago Free Press."

I was especially impressed with Spiderman's sharing of his abuse experience as a child. I feel that children's attachment to Spiderman will make them sympathize with his story, thus the children will possibly feel that they are not alone in an abuse situation and this can happen to anyone: two very important facts relating to child sexual abuse. Also, the character gave good advice when he told children, "keep telling until an adult believes you, if the first person you tell does not."

I am the mother of a three year old, who is a fan of Spiderman, of course, Josh can't read yet, but I did share this with him and paraphrased its contents into words he can understand. I have been introducing the concept of "self-awareness" and "body protection" to him for about 6 months. He liked this comic and after I had set it down, Josh picked it up and "read it to himself" saying, "Spiderman says nobody should hurt me." Also, "Spiderman said to tell Mommie if anyone touches me." That's probably the best review you've had on this!!!!

Again, thank you for printing this feature! I have joined my son in his admiration of Spiderman!

PS: If your committee recommends any books on how to tell children about sexual abuse, please let me know. I wish to obtain books like these and use them in our story time at home.

MOTHER IN NEW YORK STATE.

FEBRUARY 28, 1985.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE,
Chicago, IL.

Thank you, the Spider Man supplement to the Chicago Tribune was read by my eight-year-old son, my ten-year-old daughter, my husband and me. We all appreciate the opportunity you gave us to talk about this subject. The more knowledge my children have on this sort of thing, the easier it is for me to leave them in the care of others! This article and others like it will be put away to be read a few years from now to my youngest who is just a toddler now.

I hope you will continue to call attention to the problem and give teaching aids such as this supplement to those of us who are concerned about our children.

Sincerely,

MOTHER IN ILLINOIS.

EUROPEAN CONCERN FOR
PRESIDENT REAGAN'S CENTRAL AMERICAN POLICIES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as Americans begin to focus on the administration's policy in Nicaragua, few stop to consider the effects of our Central American policies on our European allies. Recently, a delegation from European parliaments came to Washington to voice European opposition to U.S. policies in Central America. They came as representatives of 600 other members of European parliaments who have published a report on the Central American crisis.

Four members of the Dutch, Irish, German, and Italian Parliaments wrote to President Reagan to inform him of the grave concern shared by hundreds of their fellow legislators about the current U.S. policy toward Nicaragua. The letter raises several points which are central to the debate on the appropriate role of the United States in the region.

While framing the issue as an East-West conflict, the Reagan administration ignores the roots of the crisis in Central America which lie in the social and economic problems of the region. As the letter states, the administration's policy toward Nicaragua of isolation, containment and hostility "only strengthens the hand of those forces inside the country most likely to depart from the original goals of the Sandinista revolution: political pluralism, nonalignment, and a mixed economy."

The Reagan administration's policy toward Nicaragua makes a mockery of Western values. "To compare mercenaries who butcher and rape women and children to members of the French Resistance—or even to the Founding Fathers of the United States—is an insult to the memory and dignity of those genuine heroes and martyrs who fought for freedom." In addition, the United States' brazen violation of international law tramples over the very principles of the NATO

Charter and only weakens the entire alliance.

In the upcoming debate in the Senate over Central American policies, it is important to take into consideration these views and concerns of our allies. I urge my colleagues to read this letter to President Reagan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF PARLIAMENT,
2500 EA The Hague, March 8, 1985.

President REAGAN,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT REAGAN: We are writing to inform you of the grave concern shared by hundreds of our fellow legislators about current United States policy towards Central America, and in particular, vis-a-vis the Government of Nicaragua. During the last three days while we have been in Washington, we have discussed the policy with scholars, journalists, Senators and Representatives, congressional staff and Executive Branch officials. These talks have only reinforced our judgment that the policy is headed on a course about which European elected officials—across a broad political spectrum—are appropriately disturbed.

In brief, the mainstream of Western European opinion has reached a firm consensus on the following points:

The roots of the crisis in Central America lie in the social and economic problems of the region. It is important to come to terms with the fact that, for the foreseeable future, the countries of Central America will be poor. A durable peace in the region can only be established through political solutions and economic development, and these must be rooted in a reasonably just social order.

The tensions in Central America are not manifestations of the East/West conflict. As stated, the revolutions in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala are rooted in poverty and political repression. Successful revolutions need not threaten the United States; they need not lead to governments that are dependent upon the Soviet Union. Indeed, it is precisely policies of isolation, containment and hostility that threaten friendly and prosperous friendships with countries such as Nicaragua.

Diplomatic rather than military solutions should be sought to defuse tensions which plague the region. Peace, gradual reform and long-term stability, as well as U.S. national security, can only be insured by negotiated settlements in the region. Further militarization of Central America only spawns further chaos and bloodshed. We give strong backing to the Contadora group effort which remains the best framework for securing a just and stable peace, and we fear that the United States does not support the Contadora effort sincerely.

Nicaragua should not be isolated. If the Administration is concerned about the democratic evolution of the Nicaraguan revolution, it must immediately reverse its strategy of covert operations, trade and aid blockades, and threatening military maneuvers. The tremendous pressure which Washington is bringing to bear on Nicaragua only strengthens the hand of those forces inside the country most likely to depart from the original goals of the Sandinista revolution:

political pluralism, non-alignment, and a mixed economy.

International law must be observed. After World War II, the United States was a leader in the international acceptance of the credo that the rule of the law must replace the rule of force. Unfortunately, the actions of the U.S. government in Central America, such as the mining of Nicaragua's ports and its refusal to admit to the validity of the International Court of Justice, are seen by many Europeans as proof that the United States is prepared to disregard the principles of international conduct which it professes to uphold. We especially note that the NATO charter pledges a member to observe international law whenever it declares its national interests to be at stake. When the U.S. acts in contempt of the law, she undermines the very foundations of international justice and stability she helped foster in the West over the past 40 years.

With respect to Nicaragua, there are legitimate reasons to be concerned about the well-being of democracy. However, to call the contras "freedom fighters" is to make a mockery of the word freedom. Recent revelations of atrocities committed by the contras against Nicaraguan civilians—including assassination, torture, rape, kidnapping and mutilation—only leads honest observers to conclude that the contras are terrorists, not defenders of freedom. To compare mercenaries who butcher and rape women and children to members of the French Resistance—or even to the founding fathers of your own country—is an insult to the memory and dignity of those genuine heroes and martyrs who fought for freedom.

Our delegation traveled to Washington to express a concern felt deeply throughout Europe. Our views were clearly expressed at the meeting of European foreign ministers held in San Jose, Costa Rica during September, 1984. The voice of European opinion on this issue will be reaffirmed and strengthened in a follow-up meeting of foreign ministers scheduled for the second half of this year.

We are unsure of your Administration's concern about European interest and opinion on the Central America crisis. However, we do believe you share with us a mutual interest in the status of the NATO Alliance. It has become increasingly difficult for elected officials throughout Europe to defend the NATO Alliance because of United States policy in Central America. A policy which makes a mockery of Western values, which brazenly violates international law, which tramples over the very principles of the NATO charter only weakens the whole alliance. We do not write to you as mere friends, or interested observers. Your policy has a profound effect on our lives and our countries.

More than six hundred of our parliamentary colleagues in the countries of Western Europe have sponsored a report on the crisis in Central America that details the points we have raised in this letter. We are their representatives in this visit, and we hope that their concern is both clear to you and taken into consideration in these critical days.

Sincerely,

EVELINE HERFKENS,
M.P., The Netherlands.
BERNARD ALLEN,
M.P., Republic of Ireland.
UWE HOLTZ,
M.P., Federal Republic of Germany.
STEFANO RODOTA,
M.P., Italy.

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.—
"MR. REAGAN'S TAR BABY"

Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. President, as the administration begins its campaign to persuade Congress to resume aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, it is important to stop and examine the dangers created by linking America's credibility to an unlikely victory against the Sandinista government. Mr. Reagan may find it much more difficult to extricate himself from a Nicaraguan quagmire than he did from the Lebanese disaster.

In his enlightening article, "Mr. Reagan's Tar Baby," Pulitzer Prize winner Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., outlines the dangerous "slippery slope" upon which the Reagan administration is embarking. "The Reagan-Shultz line creates its own momentum. Once we talk about moral duties and define a local issue as a global test, anything short of the regime's removal will seem to some a U.S. defeat." The President's own Secretary of State recently warned, "We may find later, when we can no longer avoid acting, that the stakes will be higher and the costs greater."

The Reagan administration's policy is based on the flawed assumption that it can control the guerrillas. But recent reports of atrocities by the guerrillas, as well as "overzealous" CIA practices, make it clear that President Reagan is not in full control of his policy. "In the Nicaraguan case, the great United States is allowing itself to be manipulated by men who use the 'credibility' line to entrap us into restoring their property and power—and who hope that this restoration will be completed by U.S. troops."

The more urgently Mr. Reagan raises the stakes and pledges results in Nicaragua, the more difficult it will be to extricate himself and maintain America's credibility. As Mr. Schlesinger so succinctly states, President Reagan ought to remember Denis Healy's law, "When you are already in a hole, stop digging."

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Schlesinger's insightful article and ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 1, 1985]

MR. REAGAN'S TAR BABY

Last week President Reagan avowed what he had long denied—that his objective is to "remove" the government of Nicaragua or at least, as he elegantly put it, to make the Sandinistas cry "uncle."

The campaign to attain this objective is now under way. The president preceded his press conference with a radio speech in which he embraced the Contras, the CIA-backed guerrillas, as "our brothers." In helping the Contras, he said, we are doing what Lafayette, von Steuben and Kosciuszko did in helping the American Revolution. "How can we refuse them assistance when we know that ultimately their fight is our fight?" The secretary of state soon added that "it is our moral duty to help people trying to bring about the freedom of their country."

It is hard to be sure how far this campaign is meant to go. Some observers think it is no more than an intensification of pressure to force further concessions from the Sandinistas. If this reading is correct, then the tactic is already having some success. The Sandinistas this week decided to suspend the import of new arms systems and to send 50 Cuban military advisers home. They ask for a resumption of negotiations and an end to the financing of the Contras. But the last thing the administration hard-liners want is a negotiated settlement. If they can't avoid negotiations, they will keep on raising the ante; and they will demand continued support for the Contras, if only to maintain the pressure.

The Reagan-Shultz line creates its own momentum. Once we talk about moral duties and define a local issue as a global test, anything short of the regime's removal will seem to some a U.S. defeat. What begins as pressure may end as crusade.

If the Contras fail to overthrow Managua, the administration may find itself on a slippery slope. Some Reaganites will surely feel that, to preserve "credibility," the U.S. must use additional means to attain its objective, including the dispatch of American troops. "We may find later," Mr. Shultz said ominously, "when we can no longer avoid acting, that the stakes will be higher and the costs greater."

FLAWED INVOCATION

Mr. Reagan's invocation of Lafayette, von Steuben and Kosciuszko has its flaws as historical analogy. After all, Lafayette and his comrades were not cheering the American rebels on from a safe distance; they were with them on the firing line. But perhaps the analogy secretes an unconscious expectation.

It isn't necessary to like the Sandinistas in order to question the wisdom of the Reagan policy. The Sandinistas are a rough lot. Many are Marxist-Leninists. They are also nationalists with fierce pride in their revolution and independence. To be told to cry uncle by the American president is an insulting reminder of the idea, expressed by Secretary of State Richard Olney in 1895 and presumably scrapped in more civilized times, that "the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition."

Mr. Reagan's bullying words will be about as effective as it would have been for King George III to have told the American revolutionaries to cry uncle. Nor is it unreasonable that a small country besieged by the U.S. should build up its defenses. And it's utopian to suppose the Sandinistas will demobilize so long as the U.S. proclaims its intent to overthrow them.

As for the Contras, are they really "our brothers"? The Contras are not a unified force. Some, like Eden Pastora of the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance, are brave and worthy men. But Mr. Pastora has been no-

tably critical of the CIA and of the Nicaraguan Democratic Force (FDN), the largest Contra unit. Many of the FDN leaders—including the chief of operations, the chief of intelligence, the chief of logistics and the chief of personnel—are reportedly veterans of the National Guard, which in the good old days was the Somoza family's personal instrument of terror. Men trained in such a school rarely alter their habits, and newspapermen have described the depredations and atrocities they leave in their trail. "U.S. support for the Contras," Sen. Claiborne Pell has well said, "flies in the face of the administration's anti-terrorist policy." These guardsmen may be the brothers of Ronald Reagan. I doubt that they are really the brothers of most citizens of the U.S.

Yet they are the men to whom Mr. Reagan proposes to entrust the honor and prestige of the republic. The objection to doing this proceeds not from idealism but from realism. Mr. Reagan supposes he can control his guerrillas. The idea that the patron can control the client is an abiding American illusion—an illusion that has mysteriously survived bitter experience to the contrary in China and Indochina.

Once the patron commits himself to the achievement of the client's goals, his own leverage shrinks. He must now renounce his ultimate sanction—the withdrawal of support from the client. He is no longer the manipulator but the manipulated. He ends less the client's patron than his prisoner. In the Nicaraguan case the great U.S. is allowing itself to be manipulated by men who use the "credibility" line to entrap us into restoring their property and power—and who hope that this restoration will be completed by U.S. troops.

The administration has now cast aside the pretense that its purpose in backing the Contras was simply to stop arms shipments to the Salvadoran insurgents. This was at best a tenuous point, since solid evidence is lacking that such shipments have taken place in recent years. But in avowing his real objective, Mr. Reagan faces the obstacle of the Boland Amendment, which prohibits U.S. support for the overthrow of the Nicaraguan government. When asked about the Boland Amendment in his press conference, our president responded with an airy reference to "some of the proposals that have been made in Congress." The Boland Amendment is no proposal. It is an act of Congress, signed into law by Ronald Reagan.

The new policy also faces obstacles in international law. Mr. Reagan propounded a novel doctrine in his State of the Union message. "Support for freedom fighters is self-defense," he said, "and totally consistent with the OAS and U.N. Charters." But "self-defense," as Abraham Lincoln pointed out long ago, is a mighty elastic concept. Suppose, Lincoln wrote, a president claiming self-defense invaded Canada because he thought the British were about to invade us. "You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us' but he will say to you 'be silent; I see it, if you don't.'" Let a president invade a neighbor whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, Lincoln said, "and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect."

The belief that support for freedom fighters is exempt from international law has long been a Soviet doctrine, though they prefer the term "wars of national liberation." As Mr. Reagan showed when he pulled the U.S. out of the Nicaragua case in

the World Court, he is coming close to the Soviet position that a superpower is a law unto itself in world affairs.

Mr. Reagan ought to count carefully the costs of an interventionist policy in Central America. He is a lame-duck president, and his power to attain his domestic goals will steadily trickle away in the months ahead. Intervention in Central America will derail his domestic program and use up wasting political assets. The Second American Revolution announced in the State of the Union address will perish in Nicaragua as surely as Lyndon Johnson's Great Society perished in Vietnam. The new Central American line puts Mr. Reagan's second term at risk—unless, of course, he already despairs of coping with the farm problem, the deficit, the tax bill and other local vexations and, like other leaders known to history, sees in foreign war an escape from domestic perplexity.

A Marxist-Leninist Nicaragua is a problem—though as Sen. William Fulbright said of Cuba in 1961, it is a thorn in our side, not a dagger in our heart. The Soviet Union obviously rejoices in our Central American discomfort, but the administration has never vouchsafed a rigorous analysis as to how Moscow can exploit the situation to its strategic benefit.

Moscow knows that it cannot install nuclear-missile bases in the Western Hemisphere in 1985 any more than it could in 1962. As for economic aid to Nicaragua, why, as the Latin Americans put it, would Moscow fatten a lamb in the jaws of a lion? The Kremlin will do its best to keep the revolutionary pot boiling on a low-cost, low-risk basis, but it will not invest much in the way of arms or money or prestige because it understands how hopelessly vulnerable any such investment would be.

CONSULT THE NEIGHBORS

If the Nicaraguan threat lies in the export of revolution to neighboring countries, perhaps we should consult with the neighbors before we rush into action ourselves. They are far closer to the threat than we are, far more familiar with the territory and just as determined to protect themselves. State Department officials say that few of our Latin American allies would support us in breaking relations with Nicaragua. If the neighbors still see possibilities in diplomacy, why should we put our chips on military power? If diplomacy fails, force is always available, and it is better to use it with our Latin American friends than without them. Unilateral action by the U.S. is a sure loser.

I find it hard to believe that Ronald Reagan will actually send American boys to kill and die in Central America. But the more urgently he raises stakes and pledges results, the more difficult it will be to extricate himself. He should remember Denis Healey's law: When you are already in a hole, stop digging. Mr. Reagan will not find it as easy to shed Nicaragua as it was to shed Lebanon. He may well end up playing Br'er Rabbit to the Nicaraguan tar baby.

A WINNING TRADITION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, once again the Commonwealth of Kentucky has excelled on the basketball court. Five Kentucky college and university basketball teams turned in sterling performances this season, and were justly rewarded with invitations to

post-season tournaments. The winning tradition continues.

The University of Kentucky at Lexington—site of this year's Final Four—made its 30th NCAA Tournament appearance this year, more than any other team in the Nation. It was the sixth year in a row that Coach Joe B. Hall led his "Wildcats" to the tournament. The "Cats" have now chalked up 1,378 wins—again, more than any other school in the country. It will be under a new leader, but you can bet that University of Kentucky will be back to the NCAA very soon.

Down in the southern part of the State, the Western Kentucky University "Lady Toppers" made their first NCAA tournament appearance this year. After only nine seasons of women's basketball at Western, Coach Paul Sanderford led his team to the Midwest regional title and on to the Final Four. The "Lady Toppers" set a school record this year, winning 28 games. I am very proud of these folks.

The University of Louisville continued in its tradition of excellence on the court this season, going all the way to the semifinals of the National Invitational Tournament. This was University of Louisville's 11th appearance in the NIT, in addition to 17 NCAA Tournament appearances. By posting a winning record again this year, Coach Denny Crum's "Cardinals" extended their winning streak—the longest in the country—to 40 consecutive winning seasons.

Centre College in Danville, KY, a school with an excellent academic reputation, also has a typical Kentucky basketball program—and, as you probably have guessed by now, typical in Kentucky basketball means excellent. Coach Tom Bryant's "Colonels" this year won their third consecutive College Athletic Conference Championship, and then went on to the NCAA Division III Tournament. Not satisfied with the conference title, the Colonels went down to Greensboro, NC, and came home with the South Regional Championship in hand.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues just a few of the accomplishments of the Panthers of Kentucky Wesleyan College in my hometown of Owensboro, KY. The Panthers this year went all the way to the division II semifinals, making their 11th appearance in the final four—a division II record. It was the team's third trip to the Final Four in the past 4 years. On their way to tying for the Great Lakes Valley Conference Championship, the Panthers broke eight school records and seven conference records. Kentucky Wesleyan is led by Coach Michael Pollio, who in 5 short years has amassed 117 wins and only 34 losses.

Mr. President, in Kentucky we do not just grow good tobacco, raise fast horses, and make smooth bourbon—we

also field some of the finest college basketball teams in the country. These teams are deserving of our praise and support. We certainly love them in Kentucky; with teams like these, the basketball season does not end until well into spring, which gives Kentuckians about a month to gear up for the Derby.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR WEICKER ON THE CHALLENGE TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, no Senator has been a more vigorous and articulate defender of constitutional principles than the senior Senator from Connecticut, LOWELL WEICKER. His energetic adherence to the ideals that undergird our country's fundamental charter must be a source of pride to all the citizens of the Constitution State.

On March 18, 1985, Senator WEICKER testified before a joint committee of the Connecticut State Legislature concerning two of the most serious contemporary challenges to our Constitution: the proposed constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget, and the call for a constitutional convention under article V to propose such an amendment. Senator WEICKER's trenchant comments on these important topics deserve a wider audience. Members of Congress, State legislators, and thoughtful citizens would all benefit from careful consideration of Senator WEICKER's perspective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Senator LOWELL WEICKER before the Connecticut State Legislature Committee on Government Administration and Elections be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LOWELL WEICKER, JR.

Senator Lovegrove, Representative Schindler and members of the Committee, it is a unique pleasure for me to testify before you this morning as you consider S.J. Res. 23, calling for a Constitutional convention on the matter of a balanced budget. I am proud to be the Senior Senator from the "Constitution State" and hope that as members of the Connecticut legislature, you will honor our state by defeating this seductive but dangerous proposal.

In remarks this morning I will divide my time between objection to the end this process hopes to achieve, a balanced budget

Constitutional amendment, and the means it proposes for achieving it, the Article V Constitutional Convention. It's difficult to say which represents the greater danger.

First, the balanced budget amendment. Our recent political and economic history has been turned on its head over the last five years. We have seen the federal budget deficit mushroom from \$40 billion in 1979 to \$222 billion just five years later. We have seen taxes cut and priorities realigned and defense spending increased as never before, and the estimates are that the deficit will climb to \$300 billion per year by 1989. And what is the response? The President and politicians from both parties, who will not deal with record budget deficits, are reaching for a Constitutional fig leaf to cover their naked inability to match rhetoric with results. Unfortunately, the coverage they have chosen is too transparent to get the job done.

During President Reagan's State of the Union speech and his FY86 budget request, he expressed a strong desire for a balanced budget. Well, my fellow Nutmeggers, that's like the quarterback of the football team leaving the field, going into the stands and shouting "We want a touchdown!" The President has submitted five budgets to the Congress, each further from the balanced budget goal. And the Congress has passed them making only small reductions in those deficits each year. We are not your average bear. If the President and the Congress want to balance the budget we have the power to balance it—now.

The federal budget is in perilous shape not because of the lack of procedural mechanisms to reduce spending but because of the lack of political courage to deal with the problem. A constitutional amendment will not confer that virtue on the body politic; more likely it will create a generation of legislative bootleggers who find their way around or through the Constitution to do their thing without risk.

That brings me to my central concern, that it is nothing less than the Constitution of the United States that is at stake here. Alexander Hamilton wrote that: "Constitutions should consist only of general provisions; the reason is that they must necessarily be permanent, and that they cannot calculate for the possible change of things."

Our Constitution, like no other document in history, has conferred on the American people the blessings of both order and justice because it establishes ideals rather than make policy. To enshrine in that document a particular device of economic policy, along side the freedom of speech, the freedom of the person and right to vote is to demean and encumber our greatest strength.

How then shall we deal with the budget crisis? A group of fellow Republicans and I have tried with some limited success to fashion budget proposals which approach deficit reduction comprehensively. All federal activities must be addressed; defense must be reduced; entitlement programs must be reformed; and yes taxes must be raised. But I do not believe this problem will be licked until the American people demand it in the voting booth. That is how the Framers of the Constitution intended such changes to occur, not by taking a red pen to the nation's founding charter.

What I'm saying here, basically, is that the responsibility lies as much with the American people, with the voters of the State of Connecticut, as it does with their representatives, be they in Hartford or in Washington. I'm reminded of that great

passage in Harry Truman's book, "Plain Speaking." He was asked a question, "Did it bother you, leaving the pomp and circumstance of Washington? Of the White House?" and Truman responded "Never gave me any trouble at all. I always kept in mind something old Ben Franklin said at that meeting in Philadelphia we were talking about. They had a big discussion about what should be done about ex-Presidents, and Alexander Hamilton I think it was said that it would be a terrible thing to degrade them by putting them back among the common people after they'd had all that power. But old Ben Franklin didn't agree. It's here someplace . . . I've got it, what he said . . . Here, read it."

Franklin said, "In free governments the rulers are the servants and the people their superiors and sovereigns. For the former therefore to return among the latter is not to degrade them but to promote them."

Mr. Truman smiled, and he said, "I kept that in mind when I was in the White House, and I've had it in mind ever since I got my . . . promotion."

The point also has to be made then—this is not a matter just for the politicians, this matter of balanced budgets and our Constitution. It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us.

Abraham Lincoln wrote, "What is conservatism? Is it not adherence to the old and tried, against the new and untried?" With the pending proposal to convene a constitutional convention, many self-proclaimed conservatives have adopted what history clearly portrays as a radical approach to the Constitution. Twenty-six times over nearly 200 years, the Congress and the States have followed the "old and tried" means of amending the Constitution: a two-thirds vote of the House and Senate, approved by three-fifths of the States. As a point of fact that effort continues today in Congress. However, the proponents of the "new and untried" seek a different path. I cannot begin to catalog for the members of the committee the plethora of legal issues which such a convention presents. What makes matters all the more uncertain is the complete absence of any experience or legal precedent from which to decide them. And again it is nothing less than the Constitution that is at stake. Anyone who tells you that he or she knows definitively how such a convention would work and what the Constitution would look like after they finish with it cannot be trusted with matters of such consequence. Suffice it to say that when a convention was convened in 1787 "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation", that document was scrapped and our current Constitution was drafted.

The magnitude of the risks involved in such an undertaking tower over even the most optimistic assessment of benefits we may derive.

I very much appreciated listening to my friend George Will when he was on This Week with David Brinkley, and Will, with I'm sure tongue in cheek, said the following: "The big question is, if you're going to have another Constitutional Convention, who's going to play Benjamin Franklin, who's going to be James Madison? If it's going to be Jerry Falwell and Gloria Steinem we want to think twice."

I took an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Today I am fulfilling that oath. In the battles I have fought on the Senate floor for that document, none of which have

been popular, whether separation of powers, religious freedom, the right to vote or the accountability in law of a president, I have found the more I become immersed in that document, the greater my respect for it grows. A balanced budget amendment, as to substance, or a constitutional convention, as to procedure, diminishes that greatness. Once lost, we all lose.

In conclusion let me say this: If we want to spend our children's monetary inheritance, that's not too gutsy but they can probably survive it. And indeed that is what we're doing with increased deficits. But don't squander their inheritance of Constitutional ideals. Such currency can never be replaced. Thank you very much.

THE CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF BREWTON, AL

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, as the senior Senator from the State of Alabama, I am pleased and proud to congratulate the citizens of the town of Brewton, AL, on their upcoming centennial celebration.

Brewton, the county seat of Escambia County, is located in the central portion of the extremely southern end of Alabama, just a few miles north of the Alabama-Florida State line. History records that the earliest name given in the area that would become Brewton was "The Crossroads," since a trail connected the Old Wolf Creek with Fort Crawford. That fort had been established by the U.S. Government in 1818 as a supply base and defense against Indians.

The earliest settlers were two brothers, Benjamin and Joseph Bruton, who were in the area as early as 1816. In the 1850's, the Alabama & Florida Railroad surveyed a right-of-way in the Brewton area. As word spread that a depot would be located at "The Crossroads," settlers began to congregate in the area, forming the first real community.

The first local station agent for the railroad was Edmund Troupe Bruton, the great-nephew of the original settlers. Following tradition, the new town was named after its station agent, only the nameplate on the depot was misspelled, as "Brewton." Rather than change the sign, all the Brutons in the area changed the spelling of their name.

The town was first incorporated in 1874, but the records of this incorporation were destroyed when the courthouse at Pollard, the original county seat, burned in 1879. That fire would lead to the removal of the county government to Brewton. After the fire, it was 1882 when the town again petitioned for incorporation. The State of Alabama approved the incorporation of February 13, 1885. It is that approval which is being celebrated with this centennial.

As with all towns, Mr. President, Brewton and its citizens have had to work to overcome hardships. In this

case, however, there seem to have been a disproportionate share.

In the fall of 1883, Brewton was visited by a devastating yellow fever epidemic, one of the darkest periods in the town's history. The epidemic struck on September 12 and continued until early November, recording a total of 70 cases and 28 deaths.

In addition, Brewton suffered through three major fires in its early years. The first occurred in 1886 and destroyed several downtown buildings. A system of fire protection was begun, but was incomplete when fire again destroyed nearly all the business section in 1888. Fire hit again 1896, destroying 15 buildings. After each fire, the determined citizens refused to give up, and the town was soon graced with new and better buildings.

Brewton is situated in the fork of Burnt Corn Creek and Murder Creek, and this location has caused the town to experience many devastating floods. History shows that floods have been recorded in 1847, 1864, 1888, 1913, 1928, 1929 and 1975. Of these, the 1929 flood has been considered the most costly, although the most recent caused estimated damage of more than \$4.5 million.

In more recent years, Brewton has profited from the establishment of Jefferson Davis Junior College, which opened in the fall of 1965. This institution has grown to be one of the State's finest junior colleges.

Mr. President, from April 19 through 28, Brewton will be celebrating its centennial. This celebration is, in reality, a ceremony to honor all of the citizens of Brewton, past and present, who have always worked to see that Brewton has bright tomorrows. This persistent civic dedication is best illustrated by the fine community these efforts have built in Brewton.

Mr. President, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to represent the people of Brewton, AL, in the U.S. Senate. They can take a great deal of pride in the significant and proud history of their town, and, with continued civic dedication, can look forward to an even brighter future.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN W. BLOOMER

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, one of the great strengths of our Nation lies in our provisions for and protection of freedom of the press. Although many people in the public life are often at odds with members of the press, I believe it is important to realize that their job—keeping the public informed—is an important one, and to respect those that do this job and do it well.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I am particularly saddened to note the recent death of an outstand-

ing newspaper leader, John W. Bloomer, former editor of the Birmingham News.

John's long career in journalism began while he was a student at Indiana University. He ran short of money and applied for a job at the Wabash Plain-Dealer, where he was hired as sports editor and city hall reporter. For the rest of his life, newspapers were to be in his blood.

After only 1 year, his publisher asked John W. Bloomer to serve as editor of the Elizabethton, TN, Star. At that time, he was only 21. Along with a stint in the U.S. Air Force, John served in executive positions with newspapers in Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Virginia, and Mississippi. During these years, he gained an outstanding reputation across the Southeast.

In the 1950's when Phenix City, AL, was thoroughly crime-ridden, John W. Bloomer was the managing editor of the Columbus, GA, Ledger and Inquirer, located just across the State line. Under his leadership, the paper courageously exposed the corruption, bringing about the move to clean up Phenix City. For these efforts, the newspaper was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for meritorious public service.

John was Mississippi editor of the Birmingham News for a short time, and then worked briefly for a paper in Jackson, MS, before returning to the News for good, as an editorial writer in 1959. Two years later, he was named managing director, a position from which he directed coverage during the civil rights struggles of 20 years ago. Later, he was appointed editor of the News. John retired from that post in 1978.

Although John W. Bloomer was known to say that newspapering was his recreation and hobby, as well as his work, he was also active in a wide range of civic activities. Among the long list of civic organizations to which he belonged were the Birmingham Kiwanis Club, the American Heart Association, and the Alabama Lung Association. He was also a past president of the Alabama Symphony Association.

In 1976, when a major earthquake caused great devastation in Guatemala, John was instrumental in having two field hospitals sent to the Central American nation within a week of the tragedy. He also promoted a statewide relief campaign that raised \$55,000. Following this involvement, he served as president of Alabama Partners of the Americas, an organization which supports health, education, and cultural development in Guatemala. Under his guidance, 12 Alabama cities established special ties with sister cities in Guatemala. For all of his work in this area, John received an award from the Medical Association of the State of Alabama.

Among the numerous other honors he received were awards from the Environmental Protection Agency, two Keep America Beautiful Awards and the Alabama Wildlife Federation Award.

At the time of his death, he was serving as editor of Caribbean Today magazine and as chairman of the Alabama Environmental Quality Association.

Mr. President, John W. Bloomer was not only a great newspaperman, but a great Alabamian. Under his guidance, the Birmingham News flourished, and because of his work, Alabama has become a better place. He will be missed by all who knew him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial and an article from the Birmingham News and an article from the Birmingham Post-Herald be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN W. BLOOMER

If editors are not a bit crusty when they take on the job, they soon become so. And John W. Bloomer, retired editor of the Birmingham News wore his crustiness somewhat as a badge of office. Hundreds of reporters who have worked under his tutelage will testify, however, that under the crustiness beat a heart as tender and sometimes as anxious as the heart of a young father. A newsman in trouble could count on his help.

Bloomer was proud of his newspaper. He often said newspapering was not only his work, but his recreation and his hobby. The long hours he put in routinely are proof. He was proud of his profession, although not blind to its faults. He was proud of Birmingham and Alabama. And he believed with all his heart that the United States of America was the finest country in the world and a worthy model for all men seeking freedom and the fullest development of their talents.

Bloomer also felt that communism was democracy's natural enemy. He feared that political reformers often are so habituated to freedom that they have great difficulty perceiving and understanding the difference between communism's claims and its performance.

Bloomer put down his journalist's roots in weekly newspapers, on papers where the editor is often reporter, copy editor and typesetter. He learned first hand the impact of news on the citizens of a small town and the value they place on it. All of this stood him in good stead when he became managing editor of the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger and piloted that newspaper to a Pulitzer Prize for its coverage of the Phenix City cleanup during the 1950s.

Bloomer felt that one of the cardinal virtues of a good journalist is skepticism. Good journalists, he said, attack facts. They look at them from all sides to see if they really are facts or fantasies. Honesty, or integrity, he felt, is the bedrock of any newspaper. For a newspaper to have credibility, it must be honest and forthright or readers will soon come to distrust it.

Like most newsmen, he believed staunchly in freedom of the press and the public's right to know. He believed also that freedom carried with it a great responsibility. And he often said these virtues must never

be used hypocritically to mask irresponsibility, vindictiveness or a biased agenda.

All of us here at The News will miss John Bloomer, as will many of his friends in Alabama and in the journalistic community across the nation. One trust that the principles he believed in and worked for, the legacy he leaves his colleagues, will always survive fashions and that newspapers will continue to help light the way to an ever more effective democratic society.

[From the Birmingham News, Mar. 21, 1985]

FORMER "NEWS" EDITOR, JOHN W. BLOOMER, DIES

John W. Bloomer, former editor of The Birmingham News, died today in Mobile. He was 72.

During his long career, Bloomer guided a Columbus, Ga., newspaper to a Pulitzer Prize and played a leading role in groups dealing with environmental and Central American issues.

"John Bloomer was a great newspaper editor who gave years of important service to The Birmingham News and to the community," said Victor Hanson II, publisher of The News. "He was a man whose sound judgment could always be depended on."

Bloomer became ill Wednesday night while riding to Mobile on a business trip in connection with his work as editor of Caribbean Today magazine, according to A.J. Washington, Bloomer's friend who was driving the car.

He was rushed to a Springhill Memorial Hospital, where he was diagnosed as suffering from an aneurysm and transferred to Mobile Infirmary, where he entered surgery at 5 a.m. and died during the operation, Washington said.

Funeral arrangements were pending Thursday morning.

"John Bloomer was a tough editor and a strong-willed one, and a dear friend," said James E. Jacobson, editor of The Birmingham News.

"He believed in himself, in his newspaper, in Birmingham and Alabama, and he gave of himself unselfishly in literally uncountable ways to make our community and state better."

"He was involved in just about every civic endeavor that came along, and his interests ranged across the spectrum, from downtown Birmingham to remote villages in Guatemala, from the Alabama Symphony to Alabama farmers."

"He never stopped caring or contributing. Even after his retirement from The News, he continued to be actively interested and involved in issues and events."

A native of Wabash, Ind., Bloomer attended Indiana University and studied English, history, and economics. But he was short of money, so he walked into the Wabash Plain-Dealer and was hired as sports editor and city hall reporter.

A year later, his publisher asked Bloomer to serve as the editor of another paper he owned in east Tennessee. He was only 21.

Shortly after he began at the Elizabethton Star, Bloomer married his high school sweetheart, Margaret (Peg) Schornick.

After a stint in the U.S. Air Force, Bloomer served in newspaper executive positions in Tennessee, Florida, Georgia, Virginia and Mississippi.

He served as managing editor of the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger and Inquirer in the 1950s when the newspaper won a Pulitzer Prize for meritorious public service in expos-

ing crime and corruption in nearby Phenix City.

In a past interview, Bloomer called the Pulitzer "one of the highlights of my journalism career."

He was Mississippi editor of The Birmingham News for a brief time, then worked at a paper in Jackson, Miss., until he was called back to The News as an editorial writer in 1959. He was appointed managing editor in 1961. He directed the paper's news coverage during the turbulent civil rights period of the early 1960s.

Bloomer later was appointed editor of The News, and he retired from that post in 1978.

In addition to his newspaper work, Bloomer played an active role in Alabama in promoting the arts, the environment, and better relations with Central America.

A past president of the Alabama Symphony Association, Bloomer was a member of a long list of civic organizations, including the Birmingham Kiwanis Club, the American Heart Association, the Alabama Lung Association and the Better Business Bureau.

Among the numerous honors he received during his lifetime include awards from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, two Keep America Beautiful Awards, the Alabama Wildlife Federation Award, and an award from the Medical Association of the State of Alabama for his work in coordinating the Guatemalan relief effort.

When a major earthquake struck Guatemala in 1976, Bloomer was instrumental in having two field hospitals sent to the Central American nation less than a week after the tragedy and was responsible for promoting a statewide relief campaign that resulted in a \$55,000 fund.

He served as president of Alabama Partners of the Americas, an organization which supports health, education, and cultural development in Guatemala. Under his leadership, 12 Alabama cities established special ties with sister cities in Guatemala.

Concerned about preserving Alabama's environment in the face of continued economic development, Bloomer helped organize the Alabama Environmental Quality Association and served as its chairman.

The Montgomery-based organization published a quarterly magazine called *Enviro-South* devoted to regional environmental issues.

[From the Birmingham Post-Herald, Mar. 22, 1985]

FORMER EDITOR OF NEWS DIES

MOBILE.—John W. Bloomer, a former editor of The Birmingham News who helped guide a Georgia newspaper to a Pulitzer Prize, died yesterday in a Mobile hospital after becoming ill while on a business trip.

Graveside service for Bloomer, 72, will be 11 a.m. tomorrow, Elmwood, Johns-Ridout's Southside directing.

Bloomer, a native of Wabash, Ind., had an extensive career in journalism. He served as managing editor of the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger in the 1950s when the newspaper won the Pulitzer Prize for meritorious public service in exposing crime and corruption in Phenix City, across the Chattahoochee River from Columbus.

"John Bloomer was a great newspaper editor who gave years of important service to The Birmingham News and to the community," said Victor Hanson II, publisher of The News. "He was a man whose sound judgement could always be depended on."

"John Bloomer was a tough editor and a strong-willed one, and a dear friend," said James E. Jacobson, editor of The Birmingham

News. "He believed in himself, in his newspaper, in Birmingham and Alabama, and he gave of himself unselfishly in literally uncountable ways to make our community and state better."

"He was involved in just about every civic endeavor that came along, and his interests ranged across the spectrum, from downtown Birmingham to remote villages in Guatemala, from the Alabama Symphony to Alabama farmers."

"He never stopped caring or contributing. Even after his retirement from The News, he continued to be actively interested and involved in issues and events."

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Margaret S. Bloomer, and a brother, Robert Bloomer, Los Angeles.

The family suggests memorials be made to the Birmingham Symphony, the Red Mountain Museum or a favorite charity.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE DURING THE PAST 6 YEARS

MR. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I made the difficult decision to give up my seat on the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee in keeping with the new rules limiting each Senator to only two major, classified as "A," committee assignments. It has been a privilege to serve on the committee and it was with great reluctance that I made my decision. I will continue to be extremely interested in the work of this committee. I intend to watch closely the activities of the committee, particularly the areas of space, science, and technology.

During my 6 years on the Commerce Committee, I served as a member of the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space and for the past 2 years, I have been that subcommittee's ranking Democrat. I have enjoyed the work of the subcommittee and will continue to concentrate my attention and energies on the programs and issues within its jurisdiction.

I am deeply appreciative to Senator SLADE GORTON, for his cooperation and for the excellent job he has done as chairman of the subcommittee. I also thank the subcommittee's fine staff, particularly Marty Kress and Pat Windham of the minority and Pete Perkins of the majority for the fine work they have done. Also, I want to express my appreciation to the Commerce Committee's ranking Democrat, Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS, for his leadership and his willingness to work with me on the many issues which are of interest to me. I hope to continue the close relationships I enjoyed with the members and the staff during my 6 years on the committee.

As a member of the Commerce Committee, I took an active interest in many issues which are crucial to our country's technological leadership in the world. I am proud of the many contributions to our Nation's space and technology programs made by the committee in the past several years.

Many exciting and innovative projects and programs have been undertaken during this period, but much more remains to be done.

Last year, Congress approved the administration's request to go forward with the development of a permanently manned space station. As the first Senator to call for the development of the space station, I was greatly pleased when the President issued his directive to go forward with the program. Thus far, progress in the program has been substantial with the contracts for definition analysis having been announced.

A permanently manned space based facility will ensure U.S. leadership in space for many years to come. Not only will this facility enhance our country's science and application programs, it will also encourage development of capabilities for further commercialization of space and stimulate advanced technologies. The space station, highlighted by a combination of a manned station and unmanned research platforms in lower orbit, will be the key element in the commercial development of space. Because of the unique qualities of space, particularly zero gravity, many processes can be performed which are either too difficult or too expensive to do on the ground. The space station will also play a major role in the new space fields of material science, biotechnology, electronics, and chemical engineering.

I will continue to work with NASA to see that the development of the manned space station goes forward in as timely and efficient a manner as possible. It is unfortunate that NASA has had to lengthen the phase B stage of the program by 3 months, from 18 months to 21 months, due to a reduction in the fiscal year 1986 space station budget. However, we must ensure that further cuts in the program are avoided in this year's budget so that we can reach the goal of the initial operating capability of the space station by the mid-1990's.

The space station is only one of the many ongoing activities at NASA which I strongly support. While going forward with the development of the space station NASA must also continue its more traditional space science and applications programs along with such new initiatives as the advanced x-ray astrophysics facility and the orbital maneuvering vehicle. I will continue to closely follow and take an active interest in these and other NASA programs.

For the past 6 years, I have endeavored to do all that I can to ensure and enhance the technological leadership of our Nation in the world. To remain competitive in the world market our country must invest in such frontier, high technology areas as materials

processing in space, lasers, computers, biotechnology, and many others.

There is no doubt but that technological innovation is a major contributor to the economic well-being of our society. However, the worldwide competitive advantage the U.S. once enjoyed in many high technology areas is being eroded as other countries push ahead. An example of this is the Japanese lead in the development of a fifth-generation computer. In its brief history the computer has affected virtually every facet of modern society. The nation that dominates the computer field will possess one of the major keys to world leadership in science and technology. The strategic defense initiative calls for a new undeveloped advanced computer system. At the present time, the United States has no coordinated effort to address the educational, economic, scientific, and social issues arising from the rapid development of computer technology. In the past, I have proposed legislation to establish a national computer institute to provide the United States with a centralized focal point to encourage increased cooperation in computer technology among large companies, between large and small companies and among industry, academia, and Government. Direct Federal support and coordination is necessary to foster growth in targeted areas, ensure trained personnel, reduce needless duplication, reduce the cost of capital for this key industry and bring about widespread dissemination of computer developments.

In order to ensure our Nation's technological leadership in the future, there will have to be strong cooperative efforts between Government, academia, and industry at all levels. Last year, Senator Gorton and I introduced legislation, which passed the Congress, suggesting a number of cooperative programs to improve the development and utilization of manufacturing technologies. Promoting innovation and progress in emerging technologies need not involve a large investment by the Government. What it does involve, however, is a partnership among industry, Government and universities in research, development and utilization of emerging technologies. All three parties are essential—Government must provide the incentives for basic research, universities are the source of America's greatest research potential, and industry must ultimately translate that research into productive innovative and utilization.

One of the most dramatic contributions to technological innovation in recent years has been made by research parks which enhance Government, university, and industry interaction in research and developing new technologies. In hearings held last year in Huntsville and Birmingham, before the Science, Technology and

Space Subcommittee, it was evident that there is great interest on the part of private enterprise and academia for pursuing high technology initiatives in these types of cooperative arrangements.

This cooperative relationship is also important if we are to ensure expanded private sector involvement in the commercial development of space. The Government must increase private sector awareness of commercial space opportunities and encourage industrial investment in high technology, space-based research and development. Progress in this area has been made in the past year with the establishment by NASA of centers for the commercial development of space. These centers are designed to encourage joint endeavors by universities, industry, and Government in research and development activities.

Another area in which I have been particularly interested and which has great potential for commercial payoff is materials processing in space. I have advocated for many years the need for our Government to increase its efforts in this important area. Materials processing in space emphasizes the science and technology of processing materials in a gravity free environment. The knowledge gained from doing materials processing experiments in space will contribute significantly to our understanding and application of ground based processes in such important processing areas as metals and alloys, glass and ceramics, biotechnology, combustion, electronic material, and fluid dynamics. For example, a program being managed by Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, AL, in conjunction with the University of Alabama in Birmingham will conduct crystallography experiments aboard the shuttle that could eventually result in powerful new drugs to fight cancer. And last year experiments were held aboard the shuttle to isolate insulin-producing beta cells from pancreatic tissue that could lead to a new diabetes treatment. The potential technological, medical, and economic benefits from producing products in space is unlimited.

During the past years, I have also been interested in the research and development of laser technology. At my urging in 1979 and 1980 the subcommittee held hearings to examine the Federal efforts in laser research and technology development. The purpose of those hearings was to provide a broad overview of the current and potential applications of lasers, including construction, textiles, medicine, space propulsion, Earth, and space sensing, isotope separation, fusion and directed energy weapons for national defense.

Since the initial discovery of the laser in 1960, practical applications of laser technology have already proved to be a great benefit in manufacturing,

retailing, medicine, and advanced communication fields. However, the potential for laser application in space exploration and in the crucial areas of national defense and energy production has yet to be realized. In my judgment, this potential makes laser technology one of the most exciting and important scientific fields of research being conducted in this century.

During our hearings, noted scientists testified on the various potential applications of laser technology, stating that many of our Nation's problems could be solved through its use. For example, there is great potential for lasers to be used in the production of electricity through clean and safe nuclear fusion—as opposed to the current method of nuclear fusion. This application of laser technology can provide our Nation with an inexhaustible supply of cheap and clean electric power without the dangers of nuclear reactor accidents or the problems caused by radio active nuclear wastes.

The committee also received testimony on the great potential for laser application in space exploration particularly through the use of laser propulsion.

One very important and revealing aspect of our hearings dealt with the potential for using laser systems in our national defense. Our committee found that high energy lasers offer the potential for directed energy weapons in which hostile targets could be disabled or killed by the energy of the laser beam. Scientists from the Army's missile laboratory testified that laser weapons could be used against both air and ground threats, selectively attacking and destroying single enemy targets in the midst of a host of friendly vehicles. More importantly, experts from the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization in Huntsville, AL testified that a space-based laser weapons system could be developed to potentially provide an umbrella of protection over our Nation from enemy missile-delivered nuclear weapons. The roles for such a laser weapons system could include engagement of a reentry vehicle during boost phase; engagement of the deployed reentry vehicle in flight and engagement of the vehicle during reentry into the atmosphere.

Although many of our witnesses concluded that the potential of laser devices for use in our national defense is unlimited, it was nonetheless the policy of the Department of Defense at that time to go forward with the research and development of high energy lasers at a very moderate pace. This strategy was based, in part, on a conclusion that it was premature for high energy laser weapon system development programs. However, our committee found that the Soviets were out spending the United States by 3-

to 4 times in the field of high energy lasers. In the report to Congress issued by the Commerce Committee on our findings, the following recommendations were made:

Current experimental laser devices and associated technology appear to be approaching levels of maturity to support some potential near term applications, such as anti-sensor systems, and appear to be scaleable to support other potential applications such as antisatellite and low-altitude air defense for ships and ground-based targets. Much additional research and experimentation must be done to support the most difficult applications, such as defense against tactical, submarines launched, and intercontinental-range ballistic missiles.

The committee further concluded that laser research and development was fragmented and highly compartmentalized with a number of Federal agencies and civilian institutions working more or less independently. We found a serious lack of coordination among those departments and agencies involved in laser research and a great deal of duplication of effort. We also concluded that a stronger Government initiative was needed to maximize the many potential applications of laser technology, including those of national defense. In its report the committee concluded:

The DOD high-energy laser budget is spread among four separate organizations: DARPA, the Air Force, Navy, and the Army. While there is coordination among the programs, each program is directed toward technology objectives of primary or unique interest to the sponsoring organization. The individual funding levels do not permit the accumulation of the critical mass funding necessary to undertake weapon system development. There is a compelling need to revise the DOD high-energy laser research and development program and funding to achieve a balance between technology development and weapon systems development. Achievement of this objective could be enhanced by the Secretary of Defense designating an office to manage and direct the overall DOD High-Energy Laser Program.

As a result to the laser hearings, I proposed legislation to establish a National Laser Institute to improve the coordination of the various laser programs and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall Federal effort. In March 1983 President Reagan directed the Department of Defense to go forward with his plan for a strategic defense initiative which established the proper institutional mechanism to improve the coordination of our national laser research and development efforts by pulling many of the various programs under one umbrella organization.

The hearings brought out the potential for military usage of laser and related technology, as well as the fact that Russia was vigorously pursuing the development of military use of lasers in space.

I had an opportunity to tell President Reagan about the hearings and

to explain in some detail the findings at a small stag dinner the President hosted for six Members of Congress on February 19, 1983, in his private dining room at the White House. When I brought up the subject of lasers he evidenced great interest and considerable time was spent discussing lasers and related technology, as well as the hearings.

It is interesting to note the timeliness of this conversation. In an article appearing in *Time* magazine on March 11, 1985, reflecting on the role that Robert McFarlane played in directing the President to a study of what is now known as the strategic defense initiative, it is recited that McFarlane and the Joint Chiefs of Staff made the first presentation on the strategic defense initiative to the President on February 11, 1983, which was just 8 days before the dinner. Of course, it is an established historic fact that the President made his star wars televised speech on March 23, 1983, announcing his strategic defense initiative plans.

Another area which has held great interest to me during my service on the Commerce Committee has been developing the technology to improve the Federal Government's ability to predict storm weather and to more quickly alert citizens to the danger of storms. The weather radar system in use today by this country was installed in 1958. Since that time, we have come a long way in computer and radar technology. We now have the technology available to pinpoint storm-scale weather down to less than 1 square mile.

Last year I joined Senator HOLLINGS in proposing legislation to increase the U.S. capabilities to predict storm scale weather through a national storm program. Under the leadership of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Department of Defense, the United States has made a commitment to replace our obsolete weather radar with a long-overdue new technology—Nexrad—ideally sited to pinpoint storm scale weather. The development and deployment of this new system, however, is not slated until the late 1990's.

The storm program consists of the final development or deployment of the following new technologies: A modern radar network [Nexrad]; additional remote sensors for our existing weather satellites; ground-based remote sensors to measure wind motions; automated surface weather stations; refined communications systems that yield rapid forecast and warnings; and refined digital computer systems necessary for rapid analysis and prediction. It is important that the Government make the storm program a high priority and speed up its deployment of the storm system. I will certainly continue to pursue this goal.

Mr. President, the programs I have mentioned are only a few of the space and technology areas which must be vigorously pursued by the United States if we are to remain strong economically and technologically. Our investment in these areas is an investment in a future of limitless possibilities. We must continue to push the frontiers of space and technology, expanding humanity's horizon for the benefit of all.

A TRIBUTE TO J.O. SENTELL, JR.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of sadness that I note the death of J.O. Sentell of Montgomery, AL. Mr. Sentell was one of Alabama's truly great citizens, and made immeasurable contributions to the State's judicial system during his many years as clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama.

J.O. Sentell was a rare and unique character, as well as being a great public servant. He had a fine and keen analytical mind. He possessed a perceptive insight that was almost unbelievable. His wit was well known, his memory superb, and his integrity beyond reproach. In addition, he was a devoted family man and a dear and trusted friend.

Mr. President, prior to coming to this body, it was my privilege to serve for 6 years as chief justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama. During those years, on a daily basis, I witnessed just how crucial a role J.O. Sentell played in the operation of the Alabama State court system.

James Oscar Sentell, Jr., was born in Luverne, AL, on July 3, 1909, the son of a lawyer. After receiving his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Alabama, he returned to Luverne to practice law from 1932 to 1943. Then, for 4 years, he served as price attorney for the Office of Price Administration in Montgomery, along with being a member of the board of bar commissioners.

After returning to his practice in Luverne until 1951, Mr. Sentell returned to Montgomery, where he would remain until his death. He served as counsel of the Office of Price Stabilization until 1953, when he again entered private practice, this time in Montgomery. From 1962 until 1967, he held the post of first assistant U.S. attorney for Alabama's middle district.

In 1967, J.O. Sentell was named deputy clerk of the Alabama Supreme Court. One year later, he became clerk, and would remain until 1982. Then, in 1969, Mr. Sentell was also named as the first clerk of the new court of civil appeals, a post he would hold until 1975.

In addition to his duties as clerk of the supreme court, Mr. Sentell was also editor of the State bar publica-

tion, The Alabama Lawyer from 1967-82, and was ex officio secretary of the Alabama Court of the Judiciary from its founding until 1976.

Mr. Sentell was one of the founders and the first president of the National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks. In 1976, he received the State bar association's Award of Merit. In 1982, he was the first recipient of the Walter P. Gerwin CLE Award from the Alabama Bar Institute of Continuing Legal Education. He also was chosen by the National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks to receive their first annual Distinguished Service Award.

In 1982, J.O. Sentell stepped down as clerk of the supreme court. He was only the fifth clerk since 1880, but, during his tenure alone, he served with 3 chief justices and 18 associate justices.

J.O. Sentell was an outstanding citizen in every respect. His uncompromising dedication was reflected in his service to his profession and by his unyielding devotion to his family. I extend my most sincere sympathy to his wife, Dr. Jane Jones Sentell, and to their children—James C. Sentell, Charles Edgar Sentell, and Jane Sentell Preiss. He will be missed by all who knew him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the March 1985 issue of The Alabama Lawyer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN MEMORIAM

At 22 years of age, an applicant for admission to the Alabama State Bar was asked why he wished to pursue law as a profession. He responded:

"I am interested in law and its various phases and enjoy its study. I consider it as one of the most honorable professions and one worthy of diligent application and pursuit. I believe the profession affords a splendid opportunity for service to the state and its people."

That statement, penned some 53 years ago in a character and fitness affidavit, bears the now familiar signature of J.O. Sentell. Treating Mr. Sentell's reasons for choosing law as covenants for future performance, it can be stated emphatically he discharged his promises fully. Throughout his career he kept his interest in the law keen and always was its avid student. The profession was honorable when he chose it, and his conduct only added to its lustre. He took full advantage of the "splendid opportunity for service to the state and its people."

James Oscar Sentell, Jr., was born at Luverne, Alabama, July 3, 1909, to J.O. Sentell, Sr., a lawyer, and Ida S. Sentell. Upon earning undergraduate and law degrees from the University of Alabama he entered the private practice of law in Luverne from 1932-1943. He served as a member of the board of bar commissioners from 1943-1946 while he was price attorney for the Office of Price Administration in Montgomery. Mr. Sentell returned to Luverne and private practice in 1946. Montgomery claimed him permanently in 1951 when he assumed the post, until 1953, of counsel for the Office of Price Sta-

bilization. Thereafter he commenced private practice in Montgomery. In 1962 he became first assistant United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama, a post he held until his career as a clerk began in 1967 when he was named deputy clerk of the Supreme Court of Alabama. In January 1968, he became clerk of the supreme court. Upon creation of the court of civil appeals in 1969, Mr. Sentell assumed the additional responsibility of serving as its first clerk, a position he held until 1975. Mr. Sentell also was editor of The Alabama Lawyer from 1967-1982 and ex officio secretary of the Alabama Court of the Judiciary from its inception until 1976.

Also in 1976 Mr. Sentell received the Alabama State Bar's Award of Merit at the bar's annual meeting, held that year in Huntsville. At the 1982 annual meeting, he was named first recipient of the Walter P. Gerwin CLE Award by the Alabama Bar Institute for Continuing Legal Education; in addition, the bar presented him and his wife with a travel certificate as a retirement gift.

Mr. Sentell was one of the founders and the first president of the National Conference of Appellate Court Clerks; he also was the first recipient of its Distinguished Service Award in 1979.

Mr. Sentell retired as clerk of the supreme court in 1982. He was only the fifth clerk to serve the Alabama Supreme Court since 1880, but during his tenure, three chief justices and 18 associate justices served in the Supreme Court of Alabama.

Mr. Sentell long will be remembered for his loyal friendship, his keen intellect, his impeccable integrity, his elegant charm and his gentle wit. His presence and bearing was so dignified his very appearance had an uplifting effect upon the proceedings. Practitioners before the supreme court will recall with a shudder the solemnity with which he could sound the docket to a tense assemblage of advocates waiting for their precious minutes at the lectern. We also recall how remarkably accessible he was when we needed quick and sound advice on procedural niceties. His competence was universally recognized by all. He was said to possess a photographic memory.

As a frequent practitioner in the supreme court and as board member of The Alabama Lawyer, I shared many experiences with him. Through this proximity I came to appreciate a keen sense of humor, and I recount here simply one such instance. At a bar convention in Huntsville several years ago, Mr. Sentell and I were visiting with a sizable group of fellow lawyers. In the conviviality of the moment, I kidded Mr. Sentell by making the wholly groundless charge that when the court announced its decisions, he claimed the privilege of telephoning only the prevailing attorneys to announce the result. Thus the deputy clerks were left with the distasteful chore of telephoning the losers. A hearty laugh followed during which Mr. Sentell protested his innocence in a good-natured way. The following Friday at precisely 10 a.m., when both the pendency of an appeal in Montgomery and the joke I had told on him the preceding week were both very far from my mind, my phone rang and Mr. Sentell announced in his best ceremonial tone, "Champ, I regret I must so quickly disabuse you of your theory as to my practice of calling only prevailing counsel but it is nonetheless my unpleasant duty to advise you. . . ." The rest of his remarks were lost in our laughter as the sting of defeat was not sufficient to suppress my admiration for this clever rebuttal to my earlier joke on him. I will miss him.

Our bar lost one of its pillars when J.O. Sentell died peacefully in his sleep on the night of January 19, 1985. His picture hangs as a permanent memorial at Alabama State Bar headquarters, and his occasional visits to the bar building with his young grandchildren will be missed by the staff. A member of the First United Methodist Church, he is survived by his widow, Dr. Jane Jones Sentell of Montgomery, Alabama; two sons, James C. Sentell of Huntsville, Alabama, and Charles Edgar Sentell of Jackson, Mississippi, a third generation member of the Alabama State Bar; one daughter, Jane Sentell (Mrs. George, III) Preiss of Little Rock, Arkansas; and several grandchildren.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 29, 1985, during the recess of the Senate, received messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received on March 29, 1985, are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 28, 1985, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 181. Joint resolution to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the enrolled joint resolution was signed on March 28, 1985, during the recess of

the Senate by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 8, 1985, as "National Independent Retail Grocer Week";

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution designating April 2, 1985, as "Education Day U.S.A."; and

H.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to designate April 1985 as "Fair Housing Month".

The message also announced that pursuant to section 136 of Public Law 98-473, the Speaker appoints as majority members of the Commission on the Ukraine Famine the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MICA, Chairman and Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 1:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolutions:

H.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to designate the month of April 1985 as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month";

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate the week of March 10 through 16, 1985, as "National Employ-the-Older-Worker Week"; and

H.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution designating March 22, 1985, as "National Energy Education Day."

The enrolled joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolutions were read the first and second times, and placed on the calendar:

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 8, 1985, as "National Independent Retail Grocer Week"; and

H.R. Res. 188. Joint resolution to designate April 1985 as "Fair Housing Month."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING THE RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985, the following reports of committee were submitted on March 29, 1985, during the recess of the Senate:

By Mr. WEICKER, from the Committee on Small Business, with amendments:

S. 408. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide program levels, salary and expense levels, and authorizations for the Small Business Administration's programs for fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988, and for

other purposes (with minority views) (Rept. No. 99-20).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Special report on the Legislative Oversight Activities During the 98th Congress of the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 99-21).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Res. 115. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 819. A bill to extend the Federal Supplemental Compensation Act of 1982; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEINZ:

S. 820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the reduction in the rate of tax imposed on cigarettes that will occur on October 1, 1985, under current law and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that the revenues attributable to the elimination of such reduction be deposited into the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEFLIN:

S. 821. A bill to authorize the replacement of the Oliver lock at the Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ZORINSKY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ABDNOR and Mr. EXON):

S. 822. A bill to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning June 1, 1986; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CHILES (for himself and Mrs. HAWKINS):

S. 823. A bill to amend the Act of July 1948 to make less restrictive an aviation easement reserved to the United States on a portion of land conveyed under such Act to Okaloosa County, Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 824. A bill to reauthorize and amend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, to ban ocean dumping at the 12-mile site, to develop a plan for the revitalization of the New York Bight Apex and the Hudson-Raritan Estuary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SASSER, Mr. INOUE, Mr. GLENN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 825. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a program for the waiver of the visa requirement in the case of nonimmigrant tourists from

certain countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. Res. 115. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget; from the Committee on the Budget; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 819. A bill to extend the Federal Supplemental Compensation Act of 1982; to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTAL COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce important and timely legislation. On March 31, 1985, the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program, which provides an additional 8 to 14 weeks of unemployment benefits to workers who have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits, expired. The legislation I am introducing today would extend the FSC Program and make fundamental reforms to make it more efficient and more affordable.

In his televised press conference on Tuesday, March 21, 1985, President Reagan said FSC should be allowed to expire. Even when told that 340,000 unemployed Americans would lose their benefits, President Reagan insisted that FSC was unworthy of extension. As always, the President argued that his administration has created an unequal number of jobs. Therefore, he posited, there is no need for unemployment compensation for the long-term unemployed. The President seems to think that his administration has cured unemployment—that somehow the problem of unemployment has gone away.

It has not gone away in Erie County and Niagara County, NY, where 474,000 workers were unemployed in March and the unemployment rate reached almost 8 percent. While the national unemployment rate is much lower, the fact remains that in February 8.4 million Americans were out of work.

Long-term unemployment is a problem, and the expiration of FSC would have harsh effects on the 340,000 workers and their families who receive FSC benefits. During an average week in February, 22,400 unemployed workers in my State of New York received some \$3.3 million of benefits; 22,400 workers and their families lost this support on Sunday, when FSC was permitted to expire at the urging of

the President. FSC benefits are not great—indeed, they equal only 55 percent of regular unemployment benefits—when considered in terms of the workers and their families that receive them. The average FSC recipient in New York, for example received only \$147 per week—\$147 per week to feed, clothe, and house a family.

Mr. President, the administration claims that the program costs too much, particularly in this time of budget deficits—deficits caused in large part by the administration's economic program.

The administration's response to the cost of FSC is to excise the program completely, ending all aid to workers who have exhausted their 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits.

My response is to make the program work better, so that it costs less, while targeting assistance to those who need

it most. This legislation extends the FSC Program for 18 months, until September 30, 1986, and reforms the program in a number of ways.

First, the legislation I am introducing would remedy a problem which emerged under prior law in measuring the rate of unemployment in the States. FSC benefits of between 8 and 14 weeks were made available to unemployed workers in a State based on the insured unemployment rate [IUR]. For a variety of reasons, IUR is not an accurate measure of unemployment. Under my legislation, the States would have the option of using either the IUR, the total unemployment rate [TUR], or the longterm unemployment rate [LIUR], to improve the accuracy of measuring unemployment for purposes of determining the appropriate number of weeks of benefits made available to workers. This

reform is similar to one I introduced in the 98th Congress.

Second, the legislation I am introducing today would eliminate the 8 weeks of minimum benefits at the State level. Under prior law, workers in a State were eligible for a minimum of 8 weeks of FSC benefits, regardless of the rate of unemployment in the State. This provision alone accounts for the greatest proportion of the cost of the FSC Program, and inefficiently allocates FSC benefits to States without regard to the unemployment situation in a State. Under my bill, States would become eligible for FSC, when IUR equals at least 3 percent, TUR equals at least 7 percent, or LIUR equals at least 2.5 percent. FSC benefits would be distributed according to the following formulae:

If LIUR is used in the case of a:

14-week benefit period	
12-week benefit period	
10-week benefit period	
8-week benefit period	
0-week benefit period	

If TUR is used in the case of a:

14-week benefit period	
12-week benefit period	
10-week benefit period	
8-week benefit period	
0-week benefit period	

If IUR is used in the case of a:

14-week benefit period	
12-week benefit period	
10-week benefit period	
8-week benefit period	
0-week benefit period	

The applicable range is a long-term rate of insured unemployment:

Equal to or exceeding 5.5 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 4.5 percent, but less than 5.5 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 3.5 percent, but less than 4.5 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 2.5 percent, but less than 3.5 percent.
Less than 2.5 percent.

The applicable range is a seasonally, adjusted total civilian rate of unemployment:

Equal to or exceeding 10 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 9 percent, but less than 10 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 8 percent, but less than 9 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 7 percent, but less than 8 percent.
Less than 7 percent.

The applicable range is a rate of insured unemployment:

Equal to or exceeding 6 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 5 percent, but less than 6 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 4 percent, but less than 5 percent.
Equal to or exceeding 3 percent, but less than 4 percent.
Less than 3 percent.

Third, my legislation provides that when a State's unemployment rate—however, measured—falls below the level necessary to qualify for FSC benefits, the State may opt to measure unemployment and administer the FSC Program on a substate basis. A State would be permitted to establish 10 substate areas, consisting of contiguous counties or independent cities, in which to administer the FSC Program. In States with fewer than 10 counties, the program would be run on a county-by-county basis. The same option of using the IUR, TUR, or LIUR measures of unemployment would be available at the substate level. Thus, under my legislation, if a State fails to qualify for FSC benefits, areas of high unemployment within the State will still be eligible to receive between 8 and 14 weeks of FSC bene-

fits, based on the same triggers used at the State level. Eligibility of FSC on a substate basis would be based on the substate area in which an unemployed worker was last employed. The best available data we have is based on such a measure. The substate program would remain in effect until the State qualifies again for a benefit period.

The substate FSC Program would greatly reduce the cost of the total FSC Program, and, more importantly will direct FSC benefits to the areas of greatest need. Thus, this legislation reduces the FSC Program, not by eliminating it, but by economizing and improving it.

Finally, the bill directs the Department of Labor to study—and report back within a year so that we will have the information well in advance of when the program expires—on the fea-

sibility of administering FSC solely on a substate basis as well as whether other substate areas might be more appropriate.

Mr. President, the reforms I have introduced will streamline the FSC Program, and make it affordable to provide the long-term unemployed Americans with the greatest need the benefits upon which they rely.●

By Mr. HEINZ:

S. 820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the reduction in the rate of tax imposed on cigarettes that will occur on October 1, 1985, under current law and to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that the revenues attributable to the elimination of such reduction be deposited into the Feder-

al Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; to the Committee on Finance.

TOBACCO USERS HEALTH FEE ACT

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, the threatened financial crisis in our Nation's \$61 billion health care program for senior citizens is of deep concern to us all. Some recent proposals to brake Medicare's plunge into the red by increasing premiums or copayments, or delaying coverage, would only compound the problem. These proposals simply deflect sky-rocketing health care costs onto Medicare beneficiaries already struggling to make ends meet.

What must be done, and done soon, involves much more than this kind of myopic cost shifting. Congress must undertake a comprehensive, long-term overhaul of America's total health care system, not just nickle and dime away at Medicare. In a few weeks, I intend to reintroduce the Medicare Incentives Reform Act [MIRA] as a viable vehicle for cutting health care costs while protecting the quality of care for all Americans.

Today, I am introducing legislation to help stabilize the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund until Congress can achieve this greater reform goal. The Tobacco Users Health Fee Act of 1985, TUHF for short, will protect the all too fragile budgets of 30 million Medicare beneficiaries while generating an estimated \$22 billion for the hospital insurance trust fund over the next 10 years.

TUHF dollars would come from a Federal excise tax on cigarettes. The bill would hold the current tobacco excise tax at 16 cents by repealing that provision of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 which returns the tax to 8 cents effective October 1, 1985. In addition, TUHF would provide that 50 percent of the excise tax revenues are earmarked for the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund.

By taxing directly tobacco consumers, TUHF shields other taxpayers from at least some of the burden of the bills generated by smoker's diseases.

According to the Surgeon General of the United States, smoking is responsible for more disability and premature deaths than any other known agent. Smoking accounts for 80 to 90 percent of all lung disease, 33 percent of all coronary heart disease, and 30 percent of all cancer. It is a leading cause of cancer of the lung, larynx, esophagus, bladder, kidney and pancreas. Smoking adds at least \$13 billion a year to America's health care bill, including approximately \$4.9 billion in Medicare and Medicaid expenditures.

The human costs of smoking are incalculable. Most of these illnesses are characterized by long periods of increasing debilitation and suffering. The emotional and financial drain on the victim, his or her family and

friends can be as devastating as the illness itself.

Yet Federal policy has indirectly stimulated cigarette consumption and contributed to the rise in smoking-related health care costs. Until 1982, when the Federal excise tax was increased from 8 to 16 cents a pack, Federal tax rates on tobacco products had not been increased for 30 years.

According to the Coalition on Smoking or Health, the doubling of the cigarette tax under TEFRA from 8 to 16 cents caused one and a quarter million adult Americans to stop smoking and one-half million teenagers to stop or not start smoking. In addition, teenage smoking decreased by 14 percent and adult smoking went down by 4 percent. Allowing the tax to return to 8 cents at this time would signal a retreat from these achievements in health promotion and would result in the loss to the Federal Treasury of over \$1.7 billion in fiscal year 1986 alone. Holding the tax at 16 cents is a fair and responsible measure.

The Federal Government must develop strategies that not only preserve resources for vital health care programs, but lead to a reduction in health care costs and a shift in emphasis to the prevention of costly and devastating chronic illness. Because most older Americans live on fixed incomes, they are especially vulnerable to the rising costs of health care. In addition, they hear of the future insolvency of the Medicare Program and fear that it will not be there when the need for its benefits are greatest.

The Tobacco Users Health Fee Act of 1985 would substantially delay the Medicare financing crisis through a reasonable tax on a product that contributes substantially to our Nation's health care costs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in affirming our commitment to reducing the costs of health care, preserving the Medicare Program, and promoting the health of our Nation's people. ●

By Mr. HEFLIN:

S. 821. A bill to authorize the replacement of the Oliver lock at the Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, AL; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

REPLACEMENT OF OLIVER LOCK

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the construction of a new lock and dam to replace the existing William Bacon Oliver lock and dam on the Black Warrior River in the vicinity of Tuscaloosa, AL. This project is envisioned in the provisions of the Water Resource Development Act of 1985, S. 366, introduced January 31 of this year by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Mr. ABDNOR.

With the construction of this project, Mr. President, the structural modernization of the Warrior-Tombig-

bee Waterway should be substantially complete. Ironically, the existing Oliver lock and dam was the first modern structure built under the modernization program which began in 1937. Time and progress, however, have passed the lock and dam by. This project is urgently needed for the efficient operation of the Black Warrior-Tombigbee River system.

Immediately after the construction of the William Bacon Oliver lock in the late 1930's, a larger chamber size was adopted for new locks being built on the waterway. Therefore, Oliver lock has the smallest chamber of the six locks on the waterway. Traffic through the lock has increased threefold since it was first opened, and is predicted to near double in the next 20 years.

The six-barge tow which is now being used on the waterway cannot be accommodated in the Oliver lock, hence a significant delay occurs since it is forced to double lock. The use of six-barge tows has caused the Oliver lock to become incompatible with the five other locks in the waterway.

William Bacon Oliver lock has been identified in the national waterways studies as one of the five national locks which are controlling constraints to traffic. These are locks for which replacement is needed immediately. The National Coal Association has identified Oliver lock as one of the six of which replacements are required to meet the needs for waterborne movement of coal.

The study concerning the lock and dam replacement for Oliver began in 1950 pursuant to the provisions of a resolution adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives which directed the Army Corps of Engineers to examine the entire Warrior-Tombigbee system for possible modification.

The final report on the Oliver lock replacement study was submitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers last year. The final report reveals that it is economically feasible to replace the existing Oliver lock. The benefit-cost ratio is, I might emphasize, 3 to 1.

Mr. President, 2 years ago, or more specifically April 12, 1983, the district engineers at Mobile conducted a public hearing on the findings and recommendations contain in the interim feasibility report and the environmental impact statement for the replacement of the Oliver lock. At this hearing, the district engineer obtained the views and sentiments of all effected and interested parties. I am gratified to report that the response was overwhelming in support of a new, full sized replacement for the Oliver lock. I would also commend the district engineer at Mobile in his very capable staff for their outstanding work in connection with this study.

Mr. President, in this time of economic transition and recovery, we cannot afford to ignore any feasible opportunity for economic growth. The complete modernization of the great Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway offers such an opportunity. With a replacement of the Oliver lock, we shall have moved an important step closer to the fulfillment of this important objective.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

Their being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 821

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to proceed expeditiously with the planning, design, engineering, and construction of the replacement of Oliver Lock at the Black Warrior-Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama, substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, dated December 1, 1983, at an estimated cost of \$109,300,000, with such modifications as the Chief of Engineers determines are advisable. ●

By Mr. ZORINSKY (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. ABDNOR, and Mr. EXON):

S. 822. A bill to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning June 1, 1986; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

DELAY OF WHEAT PROGRAM REFERENDUM

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation that will permit the wheat marketing quota referendum for the 1986 crop to be deferred until up to 30 days after the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 99th Congress. Without this legislation, the Department of Agriculture plans to conduct a referendum that—under the circumstances—will be unnecessary and expensive.

The law currently in effect with respect to the Department of Agriculture's Wheat Program, enacted as part of the 1981 farm bill, applies only to the 1982 through 1985 crops of wheat. Without enactment of new legislation or an extension of the 1981 farm bill, the program for the 1986 crop of wheat will be governed by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Under the 1938 act, the Secretary of Agriculture can proclaim a wheat quota applicable to the 1986 crop not later than April 15, 1985. If a quota is proclaimed, a referendum on the quota must be held by August 1, 1985.

Since 1965, the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

have been suspended and supplanted by periodic omnibus farm legislation. Congress presently has before it legislation that, if enacted, would either suspend or repeal those provisions. In any case, the legislation likely to be enacted will implement a program significantly different from that provided under the 1938 act, thereby obviating the need for a referendum in August.

In 1977, the Department of Agriculture estimated the cost of a referendum at \$1 million. This amount would not be excessive if expended to implement a key component of a comprehensive program. However, the referendum presently contemplated would not accomplish that objective. It would not offer a clear choice of viable programs for producers; it would divert attention and resources from the serious issues facing agriculture; and, it is a waste of money.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a short explanation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 822

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1336) is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning June 1, 1986, may be conducted not later than thirty days after adjournment sine die of the first session of the Ninety-ninth Congress."

WHEAT REFERENDUM BILL—SHORT EXPLANATION

The bill will extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning June 1, 1986.

The law currently in effect with respect to the Department of Agriculture's wheat program, enacted as part of the 1981 farm bill, applies only to the 1982 through 1985 crops of wheat. Without enactment of new legislation or an extension of the 1981 farm bill, the program for the 1986 crop of wheat will be governed by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Under the 1938 Act, the Secretary of Agriculture can proclaim a wheat quota applicable to the 1986 crop not later than April 15, 1985. If a quota is proclaimed, a referendum on the quota must be held by August 1, 1985.

Congress is now considering new legislation to govern the 1986 and succeeding crops of wheat. This bill will allow the Secretary of Agriculture to defer conducting the 1986 wheat referendum under the 1938 Act until Congress has completed action on that legislation. Specifically, the bill will allow the Secretary to postpone the referendum until up to 30 days after the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 99th Congress.

By Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BRADLEY):

S. 824. A bill to reauthorize and amend title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, to ban ocean dumping at the 12-mile site, to develop a plan for the revitalization of the New York Bight Apex and the Hudson-Raritan Estuary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

OCEAN REVITALIZATION ACT

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am introducing legislation today to end the degradation of New Jersey's coastal waters and contamination of our fisheries by the ocean dumping of sewage sludge close in to New Jersey's shores. My bill, the Ocean Revitalization Act, would permanently ban sewage sludge dumping at the so-called 12-mile site. It would also direct the Environmental Protection Agency to develop an action plan for revitalizing the New York Bight Apex and Hudson-Raritan Estuary.

EPA announced a very important decision for New Jersey and the entire New York-New Jersey metropolitan area today. After years of regulatory delay and litigation, the EPA is taking final action to help protect New Jersey's shore and fisheries, and improve the condition of our surrounding waters. This morning, EPA announced its final decision to close the site 12 miles off New Jersey's shores, which is currently used as a dump site for sewage sludge, and move dumping further out to sea at a 106-mile site, until a permanent alternative can be found to accommodate these wastes.

EPA's decision to close the 12-mile site is good news for New Jersey and the entire New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. The Ocean Dumping Act was enacted over a decade ago. It was intended by Congress to put an end, once and for all, to continued degradation of our oceans. This intent was reaffirmed in 1977 when the Congress adopted an amendment to the act to halt harmful dumping of sewage sludge.

However, in the last decade, sludge dumping at the 12-mile site has increased from 4.7 million tons per year in 1973 to 8.3 million tons in 1983. Some projections indicate that sludge dumping will double or triple in the coming years, if these practices are not stopped. This is because mammoth, new secondary wastewater treatment plants will come on line in New York City and New Jersey, and other coastal municipalities may consider reentering the ocean with their wastes.

Mr. President, frustration in New Jersey with these practices is running at an all time high. The stress placed on the waters washing our shore by ocean dumping is worsened by the unconscionable dumping of 230 million

gallons of raw sewage a day by the city of New York into the Hudson and East Rivers. New Jersey's economy is heavily dependent on keeping our coastal waters healthy. Our tourist industry, along with a more than \$1 billion per year commercial and recreational marine fishing industry, cannot tolerate continued degradation of our coastal resources.

EPA has noted that 40 to 50 years of dumping in shallow waters within 12 miles of New Jersey's beaches has spread the official 6.6 square mile site for sludge dumping to an area of 20 to 30 square miles. This area is a major commercial fishing zone and concentrations of heavy metals and organic bacteria there have reached levels warranting immediate action. The degradation has moved inland, to about 5 miles off New Jersey's beaches.

EPA has developed a solid basis for its proposal to close the 12-mile site. The major obstacle, in my judgment, to a halt to sludge dumping at the 12-mile site lies in renewed litigation on the part of New York City, and perhaps others, to overturn the Agency's decision.

I have been unable to secure assurances from the city of New York that it will not sue. On March 21, 1985, I again wrote Mayor Ed Koch asking him to accept EPA's final decision so that this matter can be finally resolved. Litigation would further delay clean up actions in the region and clearly thwart EPA and congressional efforts to halt sewage sludge dumping that degrades the environment and threatens the public health.

I introduce my legislation to send a clear signal to those who would seek to overturn EPA's decision in court, that the Congress will not stand for continued delay. Our nearby ocean waters must not continue to serve as an unregulated waste dump.

Mr. President, closure of the 12-mile site will not be without cost to the six New Jersey sewage authorities which continue to dispose of wastes there. However, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection estimates that when the costs of moving to the 106-mile site are spread out over the large number of people served by these plants, the cost to each household would be \$3 to \$4 per year. Similar modest costs would apply to New York City households. These costs will be insignificant for the individuals involved, while the benefits to our region will be substantial.

Mr. President, this legislation is consistent with efforts actively underway in New Jersey to develop alternatives to current ocean-dumping practices. The State of New Jersey has an active Ocean Waste Management Committee which is dedicated to improving the quality of our coastal waters. Both Governor Kean of New Jersey, and the New Jersey Department of Envi-

ronmental Protection, support moving the sludge dump site out to 106 miles, and ultimately putting an end to all sludge dumping. My State is committed to revitalizing the New York Bight.

I urge my neighbors across the river in New York to turn away from confrontation and litigation, and to join in regional effort to revitalize our common waters. If we would just all turn our best scientists and engineers to work on solving this problem, I am confident we can find the answers we need.

The Ocean Revitalization Act would reauthorize title I of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act. Dumping at the 12-mile dumpsite would be banned permanently. EPA would be required to prepare an action plan for revitalizing the New York Bight Apex and the Hudson-Raritan Estuary. EPA also would be required to prepare a comprehensive assessment of land-based alternatives for disposing of municipal sludge generated by those now dumping sludge at the 12-mile dumpsite. The act also would:

Prohibit anyone from ocean dumping sewage sludge after 1986 unless the sewage authority generating the sludge is in compliance with pretreatment requirements;

Require EPA to designate dumpsites;

Require EPA to periodically monitor dumpsites;

Require EPA and the Corps of Engineers to establish and maintain quality assurance programs and;

Establish criminal penalties for anyone falsifying monitoring data.

Mr. President, the resolution of waste disposal issues is not simple. I do not mean to imply that it is. In deciding how to dispose of sludges, the by-product of secondary treatment facilities, we must be mindful that our environment is a fragile system. None of the potential methods of disposal are without problems. Disposal of toxic sludges on land, untreated, can contaminate groundwater and soils. Incineration of toxic sludges can spread dangerous pollutants through the air. But, Mr. President, our nearby ocean waters must not continue to serve as an unregulated waste dump just because the ocean is a cheap place to dump; just because dumpers have resisted alternatives; or just because it has been that way for years. It must change.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD along with EPA's announcement of its decision.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Ocean Revitalization Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. DUMPING PERMIT PROGRAM.

(a) Section 102 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1412) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

No permit may be issued or renewed under this title that authorizes the dumping, or the transportation for purposes of dumping, after December 31, 1986, of municipal sludge, whether or not the sludge is subject to section 104A, unless the sewerage authority or other unit of State or local government operating the plant at which the municipal sludge is generated is in compliance with all requirements of sections 307(b) and 402(b)(8) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1317(b) and 1342(b)(8), relating to requirements for an effective and comprehensive pretreatment program).

(2) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The Administrator shall designate sites at which materials may be dumped pursuant to this section and, after consultation with the Secretary, at which materials may be dumped pursuant to section 103; except that no site may be designated by the Administrator under this subsection until the Administrator undertakes and completes an analysis of the characteristics of the site and its suitability for dumping and of the environmental effects which will likely result from dumping. In undertaking such an analysis of each site, the Administrator shall take into consideration the criteria established pursuant to subsection (a) and shall specifically take into account the following factors:

"(A) The types and quantities of wastes and pollutants projected to be deposited in, and adjacent to, the site from dumping and other sources.

"(B) The ability of the waters at the site to disperse, detoxify, or neutralize the materials.

"(C) The importance of the site to the surrounding biological community, including the presence of breeding, spawning, nursery or foraging areas, migratory pathways, or areas necessary for other functions or critical stages in the life cycle of marine organisms.

"(D) The immediate and cumulative effects on human health and on the ecosystem adjacent to the site and the persistent effects on the ecosystem within the site.

"(2) The Administrator shall—

"(A) periodically monitor, or cause to be monitored, the effects of the dumping of materials at or adjacent to each site for which the Administrator determines, on the basis of the characteristics of the site and the materials to be dumped, that such monitoring is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title; and

"(B) at the close of the third year after the site designation and at every three-year interval thereafter until such time as the designation is terminated, estimate the extent of the dumping and other waste inputs that will occur in and adjacent to each site during the next three-year period.

"(3) If at any time the Administrator, on the basis of the factors taken into account under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (1), or on the basis of the monitoring or estimates, or both, required under paragraph (2), determines that the site is no longer suitable for such dumping, the Administrator shall—

"(A) limit dumping at the site to certain materials or at certain times or both; or

"(B) suspend or terminate the designation of the site under paragraph (1).

In making a determination under the preceding sentence that a site is no longer suitable for dumping pursuant to section 103, the Administrator shall consult with the Secretary."

(b) Section 103(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1413(b)) is amended by striking out "recommended" in the last sentence.

SEC. 3. PERMIT CONDITIONS.

Section 104 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1414) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Permits issued under this title shall designate and include—

"(1) the type of material authorized to be transported for dumping or to be dumped;

"(2) the amount of material authorized to be transported for dumping or to be dumped;

"(3) the location where such transport for dumping will be terminated or where such dumping will occur;

"(4) the length of time for which the permits are valid and their expiration date;

"(5) any special provisions deemed necessary by the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, to minimize the harm from dumping, which may include measures that the permittee must take to plan, develop, acquire, or implement, as appropriate—

"(A) alternatives for the disposal of the material,

"(B) processes for reducing or eliminating any contaminants in the material, or

"(C) processes for recycling the material;

"(6) after consultation with the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating, any special provisions deemed necessary by the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, for the monitoring and surveillance of the transportation or dumping; and

"(7) such other matters as the Administrator or the Secretary, as the case may be, deems appropriate."

(2) Subsection (e) is redesignated as subsection (e)(1) and after it the following new subsection is inserted:

"(2) The Administrator and the Secretary shall establish and maintain quality assurance programs to ensure the validity, accuracy, and sufficiency of information submitted to or used by the Administrator or the Secretary in connection with applications for permits or other activities undertaken pursuant to this title. Such quality assurance programs shall encompass, but not be limited to, the design, implementation, and analysis of sampling, testing, and monitoring procedures and results.

(3) The following new subsection is added at the end thereof:

"(j) The Administrator or Secretary, as the case may be, may prescribe such reporting requirements as he or she deems appropriate with regard to actions taken by permittees pursuant to permits issued under this title."

SEC. 4. TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS.

Until completion of the site designation or denial of site designation by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to any areas of ocean waters approved for dumping on an interim basis before July 1, 1982, the amendments made by this Act to the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (other than section 102(a) as amended by section (2)(a)(1), other than subsections (c) (2) and

(3) of section 102 as amended by section (2)(a)(2), and other than those made by sections 2(b), 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of this Act) shall not be applicable to those areas of ocean water.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1402) is amended—

(1) by striking out "sewage sludge," in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "municipal sludge,"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(m) 'Municipal sludge' means solid, semi-solid, or liquid waste generated by a waste water treatment plant of a sewerage authority or other unit of State or local government or a privately owned or operated waste water treatment plant which treats predominantly domestic sewage."

SEC. 6. PENALTIES.

Subsection 105(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1415) is redesignated as section 105(b)(1), and the following new paragraph is inserted thereafter:

"(2) Any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any application, record, report, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained under this title or who falsifies, tampers with, or knowingly renders inaccurate any monitoring, sampling, or testing device or method required to be maintained or implemented under this title, shall upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both. For purposes of this section, the term 'person' shall mean, in addition to the definition contained in section 3(e) of this title, any responsible corporate officer."

SEC. 7. SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish a schedule for expeditiously completing the study and designation or denial of designation of all areas of ocean waters approved before July 1, 1982, for dumping on an interim basis. The Administrator shall submit this schedule to Congress not later than the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. NEW YORK BIGHT APEX.

Title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act is amended by adding the following new section:

"NEW YORK BIGHT APEX

"SEC. 113. (a) The Congress finds and declares that the New York Bight Apex is not a suitable location for the ocean dumping of municipal sludge.

"(b) The Administrator may not issue, or renew any permit under this title that authorizes the dumping of, or the transportation for purposes of dumping, municipal sludge at the Apex site or anywhere within the Apex after the day determined by the Administrator to be the first day on which municipal sludge can reasonably be dumped at a site designated under section 102 other than a site within the Apex but no later than eighteen months from the date of enactment of the Ocean Revitalization Act.

"(c)(1) Not later than three years after the date of enactment of the Ocean Revitalization Act, the Administrator, in consultation with Federal, State and interstate agencies, shall prepare, and submit to the Congress a New York Bight Apex, Hudson-Raritan Estuary Restoration Plan. In preparing such plan, the Administrator shall hold

public hearings in the affected States to obtain the views and comments of interested persons.

"(2) Such plan shall—

"(A) identify and assess the impact of pollutant inputs, such as treated and untreated sewage discharge, industrial outfalls, agricultural and urban runoff, storm sewer overflow, upstream contaminant sources, and dumping that are affecting the water quality and marine resources of the Apex and the Estuary;

"(B) identify those uses in the Apex, the Estuary or on nearby shore areas that are being inhibited because of those inputs;

"(C) determine the fate of the contaminants from those inputs and their effect on the marine environment;

"(D) identify technologies and management practices, and determine the costs necessary to control those inputs;

"(E) identify impediments to the use of such technologies and management practices and to the cleanup of those inputs;

"(F) devise a schedule of economically feasible projects to implement the controls identified under subparagraph (D) and to remove the impediments identified under subparagraph (E); and

"(G) develop recommendations for funding and coordinating the various Federal, State, and local government programs necessary to implement the projects devised under subparagraph (F).

"(3) Not later than six months after the date of enactment of the Ocean Revitalization Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Congress a detailed schedule (and any associated funding requirements) for completing the restoration plan required by this subsection.

"(4) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, for purposes of preparing the New York Bight Apex Restoration Plan required under this subsection, not to exceed \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1985, \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 1986, and \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 1987.

"(d) Within eighteen months after the date of enactment of the Ocean Revitalization Act, the Administrator shall prepare, and submit to the Congress, a comprehensive assessment of the land-based disposal options for municipal sludge generated by those dumping municipal sludge within the Apex on January 1, 1985.

"(e) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'Apex' means the New York Bight Apex consisting of the ocean waters of the Atlantic Ocean westward of 73 degrees 30 minutes west longitude and northward of 40 degrees 10 minutes north latitude.

"(2) The term 'Apex site' means that site within the Apex at which the dumping of municipal sludge occurred before October 1, 1983."

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 111 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1420) is amended—

(1) by striking out "title," and inserting in lieu thereof "title (other than section 104A(d)(1))";

(2) by striking out "and" immediately following "fiscal year 1981,"; and

(3) by inserting "and not to exceed \$4,250,000 for each of fiscal years 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988," immediately after "fiscal year 1982,".

EPA DENIES 12-MILE SITE FOR OCEAN DUMPING

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency today announced its final determination to deny petitions to redesignate the 12-Mile Sewage Sludge Dump Site in the New York Bight Apex.

Jack E. Ravan, EPA Assistant Administrator for Water, said, "Today's action was taken after careful consideration and review of public comments and is designed to protect the coastal waters and shores from adverse environmental impacts. It has been generally acknowledged that the New York Bight Apex is heavily degraded, and that municipal sludge dumping at the 12-Mile Site has contributed to this. We believe that this final determination, along with other EPA actions, is vital to protect these waters."

The decision means that several current municipal sludge dumpers will no longer be allowed to dispose of municipal sludge within 12 miles of the New Jersey and Long Island, N.Y., shores.

Instead, they must relocate their dumping operations to the designated Deepwater Municipal Sludge Dump Site (formerly known as the 106-Mile Site), which occupies an area of 100 square miles. This site is located approximately 120 nautical miles southeast of Ambrose Light, N.Y., and 115 nautical miles from Atlantic City, N.J., the nearest coastline. The site is in water depths ranging from 7,380 to more than 9,000 feet.

EPA determined that the deepwater site is environmentally preferable since living resources there are more sparse and less valuable. Because of its great depth and the dispersion of dumped material by currents, disposal of municipal sludge there will result in relatively low concentrations of contaminants and reduced environmental impacts. Its greater distance from the coastline will also reduce the potential for any impact on shorelines, beaches, and near-shore recreational activities.

The 12-Mile Site has been used since 1924 for ocean dumping of municipal sludge.

Designation of the 12-Mile Site, located east of Highlands, N.J., and south of Long Island, expired on Dec. 31, 1981. Since that time the ocean dumping of municipal sludges has been continued under court order. EPA announced in May 1984 that it had tentatively decided to deny petitions by several municipal sludge dumpers requesting redesignation of the site.

The decision announced today was based on EPA's analysis of the petitions and supporting documents, Environmental Impact Statements, public comments and hearing records, and studies by EPA and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the effects of dumping at the 12-Mile Site. EPA concluded that redesignation of this site would not be in compliance with statutory and regulatory criteria for ocean dump site designation.

The fact that the most severely degraded area in the New York Bight Apex is adjacent to the municipal sludge dump site indicated that such disposal contributed significantly to the environmental degradation. EPA concluded.

Evidence of environmental degradation includes elevated levels of bacteria due to municipal sludge dumping, which has resulted in closing of the area surrounding the site for shellfishing; increased levels of toxic metals and organohalogen in bottom sediments over ambient levels in areas near the site; changes in relative abundance and diversity of species of aquatic life in areas af-

ected by municipal sludge dumping; shifts in marine organisms to pollution-tolerant species, and the disappearance of pollution-sensitive crustaceans. While these impacts cannot be exclusively attributed to the ocean dumping of municipal sludge at the 12-Mile Site, the dumping has been a contributing factor to the overall degradation of the New York Bight.

"Ending disposal of municipal sludge in the New York Bight, along with a series of other EPA activities, will help improve the overall quality of these waters, which are a source of food, provide recreation for millions of people, and are vital to the economic well-being of the entire New York and New Jersey metropolitan area," Ravan said.

"Other EPA actions include financing for construction of improved sewage treatment facilities and critical evaluation of marine discharge waivers under the Clean Water Act," he said.

FACTSHEET

Denial of Petitions To Redesignate 12-Mile Site:

The 12-Mile Site is located in the New York Bight Apex and is approximately 10.3 nautical miles east of Highlands, New Jersey, and 9.9 nautical miles south of Long Island. The site occupies an area of about 6.6 square nautical miles and water depth is approximately 27 meters (88 feet).

The 12-Mile Site has been used since 1924 for the ocean dumping of municipal sludge. In 1973, 4.5 million wet tons were dumped. This increased in 1983 to more than 8.3 million wet tons.

On May 18, 1979, EPA designated the 12-Mile Site as an approved municipal sewage sludge disposal site.

This designation was based on information presented in an EPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) published in October 1978, in addition to the assumption that ocean dumping would end on December 31, 1981.

The designation of the 12-Mile Site expired on December 31, 1981.

Since that date, the ocean dumping of municipal sludge has been permitted as a direct result of court orders while EPA took action on petitions to redesignate the 12-Mile Site.

On December 20, 1982, EPA requested comments on the possible redesignation of the 12-Mile Site since the designation expired.

Nine municipal sewerage authorities are currently using the 12-Mile Site for municipal sludge disposal under Federal court orders.

On May 4, 1984 (49 FR 19042), EPA proposed the tentative denial of petition to redesignate the 12-Mile Sewage Sludge Dump Site.

Public hearings on the tentative denial of the petitions (49 FR 21770) were conducted in June 1984, at three locations in the New York/New Jersey area. The public comment period closed on July 3, 1984.

EPA's final determination to deny petitions to redesignate the 12-Mile Site is based upon a finding that designation of the site would not be in compliance with the statutory and regulatory criteria used for ocean dump site designation. Furthermore, continued use of this site for municipal sludge disposal would result in further degradation to the area, including both ecological and public health impacts. ●

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself,
Mr. WARNER, Mr. SASSER, Mr.

INOUE, Mr. GLENN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 825. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a program for the waiver of the visa requirement in the case of nonimmigrant tourists from certain countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAIVER OF CERTAIN VISA REQUIREMENTS

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing, along with six of my colleagues, legislation to provide a limited waiver of the U.S. nonimmigrant visa requirement. Visa waiver legislation was passed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives in the 98th Congress and is supported by the administration, yet our stringent visa requirement remains unchanged. This bill is very similar to the original visa waiver amendment which I added to the Immigration Reform and Control Act in 1982.

Our current visa system requires virtually all foreign travelers—the major exception is Canadians—to obtain visas from U.S. embassies in their countries before entering the United States. This requirement causes delays of up to 6 weeks for visa applications to be processed, and the disruptive effect on travel plans has undoubtedly resulted in a substantial loss in foreign visitors to this country. Testimony before the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Business, Trade, and Tourism, which I chair, has indicated that the losses resulting from our visa policy are in the order of hundreds of millions of dollars per year and thousands of jobs.

As a strong supporter of the travel and tourism industry, I want to stress both the importance of the industry to this Nation and the significant impact that this legislation would have on international travel. The industry generates over \$200 billion per year in the United States and employs more than 4.6 million Americans. I am concerned that our share of international travel revenues has dwindled during the past decade, and I feel that this legislation, combined with vigorous Federal promotion by the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration [USTTA], can reverse this decline. I have, incidentally, also introduced legislation (S. 374) to continue and strengthen the USTTA's world-wide promotional programs.

I am hopeful that this legislation and a strengthened USTTA will result in an increased number of foreign visitors to my home State of South Dakota. Approximately 100,000 foreign visitors travel to South Dakota each year, and the State's economy would be bolstered significantly by the facilitation of a freer flow of foreign travelers. The same can be said of all 50 States.

I recognize, Mr. President, that national security concerns justify certain restrictions on the entry of foreign

visitors, and I want to clarify that this legislation is in no way intended to compromise national security imperatives. The visa waiver program created by this bill would apply only to individuals who:

First, are from nations which do not require U.S. visitors to obtain visas;

Second, are from nations with historically low rates of refusal on applications for U.S. nonimmigrant visas and low rates of violation of nonimmigrant status among their nationals;

Third, will remain in the United States no more than 90 days; and

Fourth, have round-trip, nonrefundable, nontransferable transportation tickets.

The nations whose citizens would be eligible for visa waiver would be designated by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State.

I ask my colleagues to view international travel to the United States as an export—it is, after all, our largest service export—and to view our current policy as a trade barrier. This policy, which is not reciprocated by the nations to which this legislation applies, inhibits economic growth, employment, and international goodwill. It is no wonder that visa waiver legislation has been supported by the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the administration.

I hope that my colleagues agree that this legislation balances national security concerns with the objective of encouraging the free and welcome entry of foreign visitors. We must recognize that the vast majority of visitors to this Nation pose no threat to our security, and further, that these low-risk visitors can be identified and treated as such.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 825

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the travel and tourism industry is vital to the United States' economy, accounting for more than \$200 billion in annual revenues and directly employing more than 4.6 million Americans;

(2) international travel contributes to personal growth, health, education, and to the worldwide appreciation of the geography, history, and people of various cultures and nations;

(3) foreign visitors to the United States contribute substantially to the United States' economy by creating jobs, increasing tax revenues, and improving the Nation's international balance of trade;

(4) facilitating a freer flow of foreign visitors to the United States would provide significant economic and social benefits; and

(5) while national security concerns necessitate certain restrictions on the entry into

the United States of foreign visitors, the United States' current policy regarding entry of foreign visitors does not properly balance these concerns with the potential benefits associated with international travel to the United States.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to establish visa waiver procedures to encourage international travel to and within the United States in a manner consistent with national security concerns and the objective of strengthening the United States' travel and tourism industry.

SEC. 2. VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.—Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1)(1) The Attorney General and the Secretary of State are authorized to establish a pilot program (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the 'program') under which the requirement of paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (a) may be waived by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, acting jointly and in accordance with this subsection, in the case of an alien who—

"(A) is applying for admission during the pilot program period (as defined in paragraph (5)) as a nonimmigrant visitor (described in section 101(a)(15)(B)) for a period not exceeding 90 days;

"(B) is a national of a country which—

"(i) extends (or agrees to extend) reciprocal privileges to citizens and nationals of the United States; and

"(ii) is designated as a pilot country under paragraph (3);

"(C) before such admission completes such immigration form as the Attorney General shall establish under paragraph (2)(C) and executes a waiver of review and appeal described in paragraph (2)(D);

"(D) has a round-trip, nonrefundable, nontransferable, open-dated transportation ticket which—

"(i) is issued by a carrier which has entered into an agreement described in paragraph (4); and

"(ii) guarantees transport of the alien out of the United States at the end of the alien's visit; and

"(E) has been determined not to represent a threat to the welfare, health, safety, or security of the United States;

except that no such alien may be admitted without a visa pursuant to this subsection if the alien failed to comply with the conditions of any previous admission as a nonimmigrant.

"(2)(A) The program may not be put into operation until the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date that the Attorney General submits to the Congress a certification that the screening and monitoring systems described in subparagraph (B) is operational and that the form described in subparagraph (C) has been produced.

"(B) The Attorney General in cooperation with the Secretary of State shall develop and establish an automated data arrival and departure control system to screen and monitor the arrival into and departure from the United States of nonimmigrant visitors receiving a visa waiver under the program.

"(C) The Attorney General shall develop a form for use under the program. Such form shall be consistent and compatible with the control system developed under subparagraph (B). Such form shall provide for, among other items—

"(i) a summary description of the conditions for excluding nonimmigrant visitors

from the United States under subsection (a) and this subsection.

"(ii) a description of the conditions of entry with a waiver under this subsection, including the limitation of such entry to ninety days and the consequences of failure to abide by such conditions; and

"(iii) questions for the alien to answer concerning any previous denial of the alien's application for a visa.

"(D) An alien may not be provided a waiver under this subsection unless the alien has waived any right (i) to review or appeal under the Act of an immigration officer's determination as to the admissibility of the alien at the port of entry into the United States or (ii) to contest, other than on the basis of an application for asylum, any action for deportation against the alien.

"(3)(A) The Attorney General and the Secretary of State acting jointly may designate up to eight countries as pilot countries for purposes of this subsection.

"(B) For the period beginning after the 30-day period described in paragraph (2)(A) and ending on the last day of the first fiscal year which begins after such 30-day period, a country may not be designated as a pilot country unless—

"(i) the average number of refusals of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country during the two previous full fiscal years was less than 2.0 percent of the total number of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country which were granted or refused during those years; and

"(ii) the average number of refusals of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country during either of such two previous full fiscal years was less than 2.5 percent of the total number of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country which were granted or refused during that year.

"(C) For each fiscal year (within the pilot program period) after the period specified in subparagraph (B)—

"(i) in the case of a country which was a pilot country in the previous fiscal year, a country may not be designated as a pilot country unless the sum of—

"(I) the total of the number of nationals of that country who were excluded from admission or withdrew their application for admission during such previous fiscal year as a nonimmigrant visitor; and

"(II) the total number of nationals of that country who were admitted as nonimmigrant visitors during such previous fiscal year and who violated the terms of such admission, was less than 2 percent of the total number of nationals of that country who applied for admission as nonimmigrant visitors during such previous fiscal year; or

"(ii) in the case of another country, the country may not be designated as a pilot country unless—

"(I) the average number of refusals of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country during the two previous full fiscal years was less than 2 percent of the total number of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country which were granted or refused during those years; and

"(II) the average number of refusals of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country during either of such two previous full fiscal years was less than 2.5 percent of the total number of nonimmigrant visitor visas for nationals of that country which were granted or refused during that year.

"(4) The agreement referred to in paragraph (1)(D)(i) is an agreement between a

carrier and the Attorney General under which the carrier agrees, in consideration of the waiver of the visa requirement with respect to a nonimmigrant visitor under this subsection—

"(A) to indemnify the United States against any costs for the transportation of the alien from the United States if the visitor is refused admission to the United States or remains in the United States unlawfully after the ninety-day period described in paragraph (1)(A)(i), and

"(B) to submit daily to immigration officers any immigration forms received with respect to nonimmigrant visitors provided a waiver under this subsection.

The Attorney General may terminate such an agreement with five days' notice to the carrier for the carrier's failure to meet the terms of such agreement.

"(5) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'pilot program period' means the period beginning at the end of the 30-day period referred to in paragraph (2)(A) and ending on the last day of the third fiscal year which begins after such thirty-day period."

(b) LIMITATION ON PERIOD OF STAY IN THE UNITED STATES.—Section 214(a) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "No alien admitted to the United States without a visa pursuant to section 212(l) may be authorized to remain in the United States as a nonimmigrant visitor for a period exceeding 90 days from the date of admission."

(c) PROHIBITION OF ADJUSTMENT TO PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.—Section 245(c) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1255(c)) is amended by striking out "or" before "(3)" and by inserting before the period at the end the following: "or (4) an alien (other than an immediate relative specified in section 201(b)) who was admitted as a nonimmigrant visitor without a visa under section 212(l)."

(d) PROHIBITION OF ADJUSTMENT OF NONIMMIGRANT STATUS.—Section 248 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1258) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "and" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) an alien admitted as a nonimmigrant visitor without a visa under section 212(l)."

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] to introduce the Visa Waiver Act of 1985, a bill providing limited waiver of the U.S. nonimmigrant visa requirements.

As cochairs of the Senate tourism caucus, Senator SASSER and I have urged for many years now the enactment of this legislation, and we have eagerly joined with Senator PRESSLER in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Business, Trade, and Tourism, to obtain for America's travel and tourism industry the important benefits this legislation holds.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Mr. President, international travel to the United States in 1983:

Accounted for 21.7 million total foreign arrivals and receipts of \$13.9 billion—including international transportation payments to U.S. carriers;

Netted this Nation 7.6 percent of total world international arrivals—286.5 million—and 11.9 percent of global foreign tourism expenditures—\$96.2 billion;

Resulted in Federal, State, and local tax revenues of more than \$1.1 billion; Directly and indirectly generated over 600,000 U.S. jobs; and

Accounted for one-third of business services exports.

Based on one study, adjusted to reflect current data and assumptions under last year's bill, it is estimated that the proposed legislation will add as many as 400,000 visitors from abroad.

These visitors will produce \$300 million in tourism receipts.

Based on these receipts, an estimated 7,000 to 8,000 travel-related jobs would be created and more than \$16 million in tax receipts would be realized.

The State Department in 1980 estimated that 70 percent of the nonimmigrant visas are related to tourism and 3 percent related to business activities.

The American embassies and consulates are frequently overwhelmed by the processing of these visas.

In some countries, backlogs are so bad that applicants get angry and cancel their plans to travel to the United States.

The State Department has determined that, if the new law had been in operation in 1982, over \$3 million in resources and over 120 positions abroad could have been used for other purposes.

POLICY AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Studies conducted in 1977 for the U.S. Travel Service, predecessor to the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, determined that "difficult entry procedures and/or difficulty in obtaining a visa" inhibited some foreign nationals from visiting the United States.

An average of 13.6 percent of potential visitors from five of the countries eligible under legislation pending that year anticipated these difficulties.

The percent of actual visitors reporting such difficulties ranged from 25 percent—France—to 4 percent—Netherlands.

Most Western European countries eliminated visa requirements of Americans and other visitors during the post-World War II era.

At least 35 countries have eliminated this requirement.

The present law requires that all foreign nationals, except those from Canada and the Bahamas, possess a visa to enter the United States as a visitor.

But U.S. laws concerning tourism support a visa waiver program.

Under the International Travel Act of 1961, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to "encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation

of international travel generally," and "to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries ***."

Further, the National Tourism Policy Act of 1981 establishes a national tourism policy whose principal objective is to "encourage the free and welcome entry of individuals traveling to the United States in order to enhance international understanding and good will ***."

CONCLUSION

The nonimmigrant visa requirements of the United States are among the most restrictive in the world.

The restrictions serve as a trade barrier, retarding economic growth and inhibiting good will.

The proposed legislation is in the national interest and will promote in-bound travel.

Making travel to the United States less restrictive will increase the number of visitors, add to our foreign exchange earnings, encourage economic growth and break down another barrier to trade in tourism.

Visa waiver legislation like this bill is aggressively supported by the administration.

It passed in both the House of Representatives and the Senate in the last Congress, and it is endorsed by virtually all segments of the travel and tourism industry.

Mr. President, I urge the support of my colleagues for this measure, and I am hopeful it will receive swift and early consideration in this body as well as in the House of Representatives, where Congressman BILL BONER has introduced identical legislation.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 8

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of S. 8, a bill to grant a Federal charter to the Vietnam Veterans of America, Inc.

S. 84

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 84, a bill to incorporate the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association.

S. 231

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 231, a bill to establish a National Commission on Neurofibromatosis.

S. 425

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 425, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases.

S. 426

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of S. 426, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for more protection to electric consumers.

S. 447

At the request of Mr. DeCONCINI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 447, a bill to amend the Sherman Act to prohibit a rail carrier from denying to shippers of certain commodities, with intent to monopolize, use of its track which affords the sole access by rail to such shippers to reach the track of a competing railroad or the destination of shipment and to apply Clayton Act penalties to monopolizing by rail carriers.

S. 509

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 509, a bill to extend the Federal Supplemental Compensation Act of 1982.

S. 518

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the so-called contemporaneous recordkeeping requirements for vehicle and to provide greater protections and incentives for investment in small businesses.

S. 531

At the request of Mr. DeCONCINI, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. MATTINGLY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 531, a bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the operation and maintenance of a Special Operations Wing of the Air Force Reserve, to authorize the appropriation of funds for the operation and maintenance of the Directorate of the Department of Defense Task Force on Drug Enforcement, and to require certain reports.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. ZORINSKY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize 1 ounce, one-half ounce, one-fourth ounce, and one-tenth ounce gold coins.

S. 664

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr.

BOSCHWITZ] were added as a cosponsor of S. 664, a bill to facilitate the competitiveness of exports of U.S. agricultural commodities.

S. 725

At the request of Mr. BENTSEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 725, a bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Endangered Species Act of 1973 during fiscal years 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide grants for school-based child care and early childhood education demonstration projects.

S. 809

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to provide financial assistance to expand the availability of child care services for college students, particularly low-income students, in order to increase the access of such students to institutions of higher education, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 35, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 21 through April 27, 1985, as "National Organ Donation Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 47

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 47, a joint resolution designating the week beginning November 10, 1985, as "National Women Veterans Recognition Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 56

At the request of Mr. DeCONCINI, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 56, a joint resolution to designate April 1985 as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 60

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 60, a joint resolution to designate the week of May 12, 1985, through May 18, 1985, as "Senior Center Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 74

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 74, a joint

resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February, 1986, as "National Black (Afro-American) History Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 83

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 83, a joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 5, 1985, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 88

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 88, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 8, 1985, as "National Osteopathic Medicine Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 89

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 89, a joint resolution directing that the National Institute of Health and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration receive full funding in fiscal year 1985 for grants for individual investigator-initiated research.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 91

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 91, a joint resolution to designate March 21, 1985, as "Afghanistan Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18

At the request of Mr. DeCONCINI, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ZORINSKY] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to installment sales and regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such provisions, should not be modified or amended in any way that will alter the manner in which mortgage-backed homeowner bond transactions are currently taxed.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 20

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BOSCHWITZ], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that payments by the Veterans'

Administration to veterans as compensation for service-connected disabilities should remain exempt from Federal income taxation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

At the request of Mr. MATTINGLY, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, a concurrent resolution to direct the Commissioner of Social Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a plan outlining the steps which might be taken to correct the Social Security benefit disparity known as the notch problem.

SENATE RESOLUTION 115— ORIGINAL RESOLUTION RE- PORTED AUTHORIZING EX- PENDITURES BY THE COMMIT- TEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 115

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraph 1 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget is authorized from March 1, 1985, through February 28, 1986, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,320,972 of which amount not to exceed \$45,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1986.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

IMPROVEMENT IN VETERANS HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

CRANSTON AMENDMENT NO. 22

(Ordered referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.)

Mr. CRANSTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 6) to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in Veterans' Administration health-care programs, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

TECHNICAL, CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE CONTINUING AVAILABILITY OF READ- JUSTMENT COUNSELING

SEC. 11. Section 612A(g)(1)(B) is amended by striking out "who requested such counseling before such date" and inserting in lieu thereof "who request such counseling".

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am today submitting for printing amendment No. 22, an amendment to S. 6, the proposed Veterans' Administration Health-Care Amendments of 1985. S. 6 is presently pending in the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, this amendment is a technical, conforming amendment to section 612A(g)(1)(B) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the continuing eligibility of Veterans' Administration readjustment counseling services for Vietnam-era veterans. This amendment conforms subsection (g)(1)(B) to subsection (a) of section 612A, as subsection (a) was amended in 1983 by section 101 of Public Law 98-160.

Mr. President, section 612A of title 38, United States Code, provides for a VA program of readjustment counseling services for Vietnam-era veterans. Subsection (a) of section 612A sets forth the basic eligibility criteria. As originally enacted in Public Law 96-22 which I authored, this section provided that veterans who requested readjustment counseling within 2 years of their date of discharge from the service or by September 30, 1981, as to those already discharged by October 1, 1979—the situation for the vast majority of Vietnam-era veterans—would be furnished such counseling by the VA.

In 1981, in recognition of a continuing need for the VA's readjustment counseling program, I proposed in S. 458, 97th Congress, and Public Law 97-72 enacted, an extension of the September 30, 1981, end-of-new eligibility date by 3 years, until September 30, 1984. In addition to the extension of the eligibility period, Public Law 97-72 also mandated that the VA study how to meet Vietnam-era veterans' readjustment needs after the September

30, 1984, eligibility expiration date and to submit a report to Congress by April 1, 1984, on its plans in that regard.

In 1983, because of my concerns that the VA would not be able, prior to the 1984 eligibility expiration date, to complete a comprehensive evaluation, as contemplated by Public Law 97-72, of the continuing needs of Vietnam-era veterans for readjustment counseling assistance, I introduced legislation, S. 11, 98th Congress, which included in section 301 a provision for a further, short-term extension of the period of eligibility. Legislation providing such an extension was passed by the Senate as was similar legislation by the House. During our efforts with our counterpart committee in the House to develop a compromise agreement, it became clear both that the VA could not conduct the type of evaluation the Congress desired in the timeframe contemplated by the extensions passed by either House and that there was a need to send an unequivocal message to veterans served by the readjustment counseling program as well as to those working in it that the Congress had a continuing commitment to the program.

Thus, the committees included in the measure enacted as Public Law 98-160 a provision that totally eliminated any expiration date on the eligibility for readjustment counseling, thereby providing Vietnam-era veterans with ongoing eligibility to request readjustment counseling at any time. In addition, that law postponed for 4 years, from fiscal years 1984 to 1988, the period during which the Administrator is required in section 612A(g), first, to plan for the transition of the readjustment counseling program from a program run primarily through storefront vet centers to a program run primarily through VA hospitals and clinics; and, second, to ensure "the continued availability *** of readjustment counseling and related health services under this section."

By inadvertence, subsection (g)(1)(B) when amended was not conformed in its language to delete a reference to the expiration date for eligibility to request readjustment counseling which was being repealed in subsection (a). On its face, then, subsection (g)(1)(B) now limits the Administrator's responsibility during fiscal year 1988 to plan for ensuring "the continued availability" after fiscal year 1988 of readjustment counseling and related services so that that responsibility pertains only to Vietnam-era veterans who request counseling by the end of fiscal year 1988. The amendment I am proposing today will correct this oversight and conform subsection (g)(1)(B) to subsection (a) by explicitly requiring the Administrator during fiscal year 1988 to plan for

the continued availability of such services thereafter for all Vietnam-era veterans, regardless of when they initially request counseling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a paper showing the changes that the amendment would make in existing law be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY
AMENDMENT No. 22

(Existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in Roman.)

§ 612A. Eligibility for readjustment counseling and related mental health services

(a) Upon the request of any veteran who served on active duty during the Vietnam-era, the Administrator shall, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, furnish counseling to such veteran to assist such veteran in readjusting to civilian life.

(g)(1) During the twelve-month period ending on September 30, 1988, the Administrator shall take appropriate steps to ensure—

(B) the continued availability after such date of readjustment counseling and related mental health services under this section to veterans eligible for the provision of such counseling and services who request[ed] such counseling [before such date].

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations will hold a hearing on S. 483 Intergovernmental Regulatory Relief Act on Tuesday, April 2, at 10 a.m. in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES
TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC THEATER
NUCLEAR FORCES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Theater Nuclear Forces, of the Committee on Armed Services, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, April 1, in closed session, to markup S. 674, the Department of Defense fiscal year 1986 authorization, and the Department of Energy, fiscal year 1986 authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND
FORESTRY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday,

April 1, to hold a hearing on rice issues relating to 1985 farm legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, April 1, in closed session, to conduct a hearing on the fiscal year 1986 intelligence authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

BUDGET STATUS REPORT

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate a status report on the budget for fiscal year 1985 pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act.

Since my last report the Congress has cleared House Joint Resolution 181, appropriations for the MX missile, for the President's signature.

The report follows:

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE U.S. SENATE FROM THE
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, STATUS OF THE FISCAL
YEAR 1985 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 280—REFLECTING
COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MAR. 28, 1985

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Budget resolution level	1,021,350	932,050	750,900
Current level	1,015,029	932,915	750,739
Amount remaining	6,321	0	0

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and which exceeds \$6,321 million for fiscal year 1985, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 280 to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and which would result in outlays exceeding \$0 million for fiscal year 1985, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 280 to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in revenue loss exceeding \$0 million for fiscal year 1985, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 280.●

CHILEAN DESTINY

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased to see the continued interest in Chile expressed on the Senate floor by my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, on March 5.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I well appreciate the complexity of the Chilean situation and know that the Senator from Massachusetts wants to ensure that the Senate have the benefit of the full story on this and every issue.

To this end, I was surprised and disappointed to see that, on March 5, my colleague from Massachusetts inserted a February 25 editorial from the New York Times into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without also inserting the qualifying comments printed in the Times on February 28. This correction on the part of the Times appeared under the title of "Editors' Note" well before the Senator from Massachusetts' floor speech. As we know, this is the Times' way of rectifying or amplifying editorials. It is interesting to note that the Times' comment said that "by omitting the context of Mr. Motley's remarks, the dispatch may have left a misleading impression about the 'Chilean hands' to which he referred."

I am sure that the Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me that a full transcript of Ambassador Motley's remarks as printed in the Times will be useful to our colleagues as they seek a more complete debate on this vital subject. I request that the full text of the "Editors' Note" be printed in the RECORD.

"The Editors' Note" follows:

EDITORS' NOTE

Under this heading, The Times amplifies articles or rectifies what the editors consider significant lapses of fairness, balance or perspective.

A dispatch from Santiago in late editions last Thursday reported on a visit to Chile by a high-ranking official of the Reagan Administration.

The official, Langhorne A. Motley, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, was quoted as saying in his departure statement, "My impression is this destiny of Chile, in Chilean hands, is in good hands." (An editorial on Monday, based partly on that report, also cited the quotation.)

By omitting the context of Mr. Motley's remarks, the dispatch may have left a misleading impression about the "Chilean hands" to which he referred.

Mr. Motley's full comment was: "From my perspective, I think that Chile has faced challenges and come a long way and, I think, still has a way to go. But the important thing, I think, for me to take back to the leaders of my Government is that the destiny of Chile is in Chilean hands—and by that I mean all Chileans: people in the Government, people that want to participate in the political process, people in the economic and social arena. And the impression that I take back to the leaders of my Government is that this destiny of Chile, in Chilean hands, is in good hands."●

YURIY SHUKHEVYCH

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 29, members of the Ukrainian Student Association gath-

ered in Washington to protest the fate of prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union, particularly Ukrainian political prisoner Yuriy Shukhevych. I would like to draw attention to the brutal and unfair imprisonment of Yuriy Shukhevych, as well as to the severe treatment of the Ukrainian people by the Soviet Government.

Yuriy Shukhevych has spent over 30 of his 50 years in prison, primarily because of his refusal to renounce the ideals of his father, Roman Shukhevych, a well-known Ukrainian activist who fought against both Soviet and Nazi domination. First arrested when he was only 15, Yuriy Shukhevych has spent years in concentration camps because of his unflagging dedication to what his father stood for. His most recent arrest was in 1972. He was sentenced to 10 years of prison and 5 of internal exile for possessing anti-Soviet propaganda, a charge frequently levied against human rights activists who have committed no real crime.

Yuriy Shukhevych is currently serving his internal exile in the Tomsk region of Siberia. There is reason to be gravely concerned about his health. There are reports that he suffers from several serious ailments, including malnutrition, and may be blind as the result of an unsuccessful eye operation.

The plight of Yuriy Shukhevych is representative not only of the fate of many believers of human rights in the Soviet Union, but also of the inhumane treatment the Ukrainian people have received from the Soviet Government.

Sixty-seven years ago, the Ukraine declared itself an independent nation. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian people enjoyed only a brief period of freedom and autonomy before their country was taken over by the Soviet Government. The subsequent imposition of Soviet collectivization policies resulted in a devastating famine, which claimed between 5 and 10 million lives. This devastation of the Ukrainian people marked the most tragic event in their troubled history, but not the last. Since that time, the Soviet Government has attempted to crush Ukrainian culture and tradition, curtail scholarly activities, eliminate the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and persecute activists who will not let the dream of a better life for their people die.

There are many people like Yuriy Shukhevych in the Ukraine and all over the Soviet Union—people who are unwilling to give up the fight for freedom and basic human dignity. They remind us of our continuing responsibility to press the U.S.S.R. to adhere to the international human rights accords it has signed. We must never forget the history of the Ukrainian people, the tragedy they have suffered

through, and people of ideals and courage such as Yuriy Shukhevych.●

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, pursuant to paragraph 2 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I submit for the RECORD the rules of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The rules, which remain the same for the 99th Congress as they were in the 98th Congress, are as follows:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

1. Regular meetings shall be held on the first and third Wednesday of each month when Congress is in session.
2. Voting by proxy authorized in writing for specific bills or subjects shall be allowed whenever a majority of the committee is actually present.
3. To assure the equitable assignment of members to subcommittees, no member of the committee will receive assignment to a second subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members of the committee have chosen assignments to one subcommittee, and no member shall receive assignment to a third subcommittee until, in order of seniority, all members have chosen assignments to two subcommittees.
4. Six members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of transacting committee business: *Provided*, That for the purpose of receiving sworn testimony, a quorum of the committee and each subcommittee thereof shall consist of one member.¹

CALL TO CONSCIENCE

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to participate in the 1985 call-to-conscience vigil for Soviet Jewry. I would like to thank my colleague, Senator RUDY BOSCHWITZ, for organizing this fine effort this year, and also the many organizations and individuals who work tirelessly on behalf of all oppressed minorities in the Soviet Union.

The recent stepped-up arrest and imprisonment of Hebrew teachers and Jewish cultural activists, and the decline in Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, does not bode well for the nearly 3 million Jews who live in the U.S.S.R. As my colleagues know well, the Soviets have not lived up to international agreements they have signed, most important of which are the Helsinki accords, which guarantee an individual's right to religious expression, cultural practices, and free emigration.

I feel that it is of paramount importance that we, in the West, do all we can to supply, at the very least, moral support to victims of Soviet oppression.

¹ For further restrictions with respect to proxies and quorums in the reporting of measures and recommendations, see rule XXVI, paragraph 7, of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the case of Stanislav Zubko of Kiev. He was involved in Jewish cultural activities and Hebrew studies. He was arrested after a KGB search of his apartment revealed drugs and a gun. He was tried and convicted and is serving 4 years in a strict labor camp.

In 1981, when Zubko was arrested, he told the court that he was innocent and that the KGB had planted those objects in his apartment. When Zubko's flat was searched on May 15, 1981—ostensibly in connection with a theft committed in the flat next door—Hebrew books were confiscated, an old sweet found in a cupboard was termed "hashish," and then the searchers went straight to the kitchen and pulled out a revolver from beneath the refrigerator. The planting of drugs and weapons by Soviet authorities is not new. For the "crime" of being involved in Hebrew studies and Jewish cultural activities, Zubko now is forced to remain in a labor camp where sanitary conditions are nonexistent, where he is provided with insufficient clothing to endure cold winters, and where he is treated with contempt merely for wanting to worship God in the way he chooses.

I ask all my colleagues, in any contact, both official and informal, with Soviet officials, to inquire about the well-being of Stanislav Zubko and the prisoners and refuseniks in the Soviet Union denied the freedom to practice their religion and be settled in their rightful homeland, Israel.●

FARMING

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I recently received a copy of a letter an Illinois farmer sent to President Reagan. It is an eloquent and moving letter, outlining how a good, young farmer sees himself and the role of agriculture in our country. Although he says he has not made living expenses in the last 5 years, he does not ask for handouts. What he asks for is a government that understands the importance of our agricultural system and a government that acts with compassion and sound judgment in establishing policies that will allow farmers to continue to operate and produce.

We have recently worked hard in this body to push for legislation that will make credit available to farmers to plant their crops this spring. That fight is not yet over. But beyond short-term proposals, we need to pass a farm bill this year that will bring some long-term stability back to agriculture.

I urge my colleagues to read this letter, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

CARTHAGE, IL,
February 15, 1985.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please allow me to introduce myself. I am Steven Brokaw, a 35 year old farmer in southern Hancock County, Illinois. I have a wife Mary and three small boys, Jason 9 years, Jared 5 years, and Jonathan 9 months. With the help of one employee, Joe Pence, we farm 840 acres of rented ground raising corn, beans, wheat, alfalfa, cattle and hogs. We do most of the construction and all of the remodeling and maintenance of buildings and soil conservation structures. 95% of all mechanical work is performed by Joe or myself without the benefit of a heated shop. We cut wood to supplement the heat in our house and neither Joe's family nor mine have taken a vacation for two years. We have not purchased land nor do we own a four wheel drive tractor or other large machinery. The newest tractor we own was manufactured in 1977. Much of our equipment is getting to the age and use it needs to be replaced, but we must make do with what we have.

During 1984 we produced 126,272 pounds of live beef that at 62% dressed meat yield equal 78,289 pounds of retail beef, which is enough to supply the average consumption for 990 people for a whole year. We also produced 155,285 pounds of live pork, which was less than half of our usual production due to the short corn crop of 1983 and at 70% dressed meat yield that equals 108,700 pounds of retail pork or a years supply of meat for 1,782 people based on the U.S.D.A.'s average annual consumption figures. Wheat production totaled 3,900 bushels or approximately 195,000 loaves of bread, which is enough for well over 2,000 people for a year. We also produced 8,500 bushels of soybeans and 15,000 bushels of corn in a rather adverse year in our part of the country. Joe and I put up over 600 tons of hay and 1,000 tons of corn silage and with some part time help, we put up over 5,000 bales of straw for bedding our livestock which, of course, must be hauled back out and spread after they are done with it.

That is a lot of work, sir, but I don't mind, in fact, I love to produce. But I have not made living expenses for five years now. That coupled with depreciating machinery values leads down the road to insolvency. We have reached a point where cutting more production expenditures no longer improves efficiency, it hurts it. Working harder can only go so far and I think you will agree sir that given our production we work very steady.

The production listed doesn't tell the whole story. As you know we provide income for the meat packer, baker, fuel man, fertilizer, seed and chemical companies, machinery and hardware dealers among others and everything we buy or produce is transported more than once in its various stages.

Unfortunately Mr. Stockman and apparently many others feel that we farmers want agriculture to prosper only to maintain a way of life. I must take exception to this thinking. It is because we love farming or ranching and get so personally involved that this country enjoys such easy access to food. After all, the only thing that separates us from Angola or Ethiopia or any number of other countries troubled with wide spread starvation, strife and political unrest are our soils, our climate and our farmers and ranchers. Take away any one of these three and we can be no better than they.

Should we allow our present efficient agribusiness infra-structures to crumble and

look to corporate mega-farms with strictly hired labor and its related problems of strikes, ever higher wages and overall lower worker productivity? Even more perilous are there those who feel that we can be a service oriented society and rely on other nations to produce food to sustain us? If so one only need to mention OPEC and recall the gas lines and other fuel shortages to see the danger of this thinking. There are those who would feel I am being dramatic about the current situation of agriculture, but truly this country is perilously close to losing its generation of young farmers as well as many who have been producing for many years now. Once a family leaves production agriculture very few return to face those risks again. Most farmers and ranchers are born and raised on the land, very, very, few venture forth from our towns and cities. It is not a nine to five job, you must have it in your heart.

Sir, I do understand in my own naive way the situation of your high office. You must consider all the people and their varied and complex problems, not just the needs of a few. I understand that just because a person is a farmer or rancher, that alone should not ensure success. We must be good businessmen as well as good producers. But sir, I respectfully submit that we must have a reasonable business climate in which to operate. Constant policy changes by our government over the years leads to chaos in agriculture. Ours is an industry of long term planning and implementation of those plans sometimes take years to complete. It is difficult enough to try to position oneself for normal cyclical changes in our markets without the aberrations created by governmental policy, at times changed practically overnight, as with embargoes, trade sanctions, imports and yes farm programs.

I watched with keen interest your State of the Union speech. We do bear a tremendous burden from interest costs as ours is a very capital intensive business. Not only do we pay interest on capital borrowed but the costs of our many expensive inputs inflates because of interest considerations by our suppliers and their manufacturers. Then, when we have a product to sell, we cannot pass on our costs by establishing price according to cost of production, plus profit. We must accept or reject a bid given by a potential buyer who deflates his bid because of interest costs incurred through his part of the food chain.

As to our exports, we cannot count on them as long as the dollar remains a haven for foreign investors, driving the cost of our beans in Rotterdam, for example, to a cost roughly equal to when we were receiving \$10 a bushel at the farm a few years back. Also, why do our grain exporters operate under a different set of Grade criteria than we must comply with at our local elevators? We can produce an excellent product at a competitive price but our foreign customers do not receive it. The exchange rate also makes it cheaper for packers to buy Canadian hogs for slaughter, than those produced by their countrymen. Whom, may I add, cannot use the drug cholelithremic but our Canadian brothers can. Is it less carcinogenic when used in Canada?

While our red meat industry struggles in a sea of red ink, grass fed beef is shipped in from foreign countries. I cannot understand how it could be cost effective to ship beef thousands of miles over the ocean when it should be produced at home on fragile land that should not be cropped but in grassland.

Livestock producers must also compete with the tax-shelter "farmers" who invests

in livestock, feed, and facilities, not really worried about producing a product at a profit because the tax benefits received will pay for the investment. Meanwhile the farmer down the road struggles to provide for his family by supplying food to the nation as efficiently as possible. We should re-examine the dietary guidelines initiated by the infamous Carol Tucker Forman during President Carter's administration to make sure that they are based on sound, truly unbiased scientific facts and not just hypothesis and fad. After all, the people who are now extending the average active life span spent most of those years consuming red meats which we now produce leaner and more wholesome.

Mr. President, I support your efforts to obtain a constitutional amendment to allow the government to spend no more than it takes in as I support many of the reductions in the current budget. But I must oppose those who advise to dismantle the SCS. The Soil Conservation Service is the nucleus of an effort to conserve an irreplaceable resource, our soil. While providing engineering assistance and advice on soil conservation practices it reduces water pollution and sedimentation. The nation really owns all the land within its borders, individual landowners have only purchased the right to use it. Therefore the government of the nation should look after its property to ensure it remains in the best possible condition for future generations.

In closing I humbly offer my service to you for whatever purpose it may serve, as I am deeply grateful for the good you are trying to do for this country. If my operation must perish in these times I pray that it will be a sacrifice that will advance this nation in some measure to a more stable, secure, and happier future.

Sincerely,

STEVEN D. BROKAW.●

THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recent articles in the Washington Post and the New York Times on the war in Afghanistan indicate that both sides are digging in for a long and bloody engagement. If this is true, and I believe it is, than we in the United States—and in other freedom-loving nations around the world—must be prepared for the difficult task of providing assistance to the Afghan people who are the victims of flagrant Soviet aggression.

The March 21 edition of the Washington Post carried an article by columnist Philip Geyelin which suggests that, despite the many costs of the war to the U.S.S.R., Afghanistan has become a high-priority concern of the Soviets. As evidence, Mr. Geyelin cites the menacingly blunt warning which Soviet leader Gorbachev delivered to Pakistani President Zia Al-Haq recently on collaboration with the Afghan rebels. Mr. Geyelin also notes that coverage of the war in the Soviet press has been transformed from bland superficialities about weapons-cleaning contests and life in the field bakery to dramatic accounts of heroic sacrifice. Much of the coverage includes analo-

gies to World War II, suggesting that the Soviet authorities are preparing the people for a long and costly struggle in Afghanistan.

While the Soviets continue to demonstrate the utter bankruptcy of their political system and their ideology—particularly in the brutal, genocidal enforcement of the so-called Brezhnev doctrine—the Afghan resistance demonstrates time and again how powerful a force is the desire for freedom. The March 28 New York Times carries a report by Arthur Bonner from inside Afghanistan which examines the zeal with which the courageous freedom fighters continue their lonely bedraggled struggle against the Soviet invaders. That the Afghan freedom fighters have waged this war of resistance for fully half a decade indicates that they are just as determined to liberate their homeland as the Soviets, pursuing a strategy of pulverization or “rubbleization,” are to subjugate it. In this context, the Afghan people deserve not just our sympathy, not merely our words, but our active assistance in fulfilling their humanitarian, their medical, and their defensive needs.

Mr. President, I ask that the two aforementioned articles may be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 27, 1985]

SOVIET SOLDIERS, COMING HOME

(By Philip Geyelin)

The experts here are not sure exactly what Mikhail Gorbachev had in mind when he told Pakistan's president at the Chernenko funeral that continued collaboration with the rebels in Afghanistan would affect Soviet-Pakistani relations in “the most negative way.” But when the Soviet news agency Tass is at pains to report such blunt language, American authorities take it seriously. One thing that is clear here is that Afghanistan is increasingly a high-priority Soviet concern.

Most of the costs of Afghanistan to the Soviets are obvious: the combat casualties; the weapons destroyed; the strain on Soviet resources; the open-endedness of it all. But one cost has gone largely unnoticed, except by U.S. authorities who monitor such matters: the demoralizing effect the war is beginning to have on the Soviet public.

The evidence is in the way the tightly managed Soviet “press” has apparently been forced to face up to a growing man-on-the-street awareness that much more than a modest, peace-keeping mission is involved, with the Afghan government's army doing the fighting. The word is getting around there's a war on. The Soviet public is still not being told anything remotely close to the facts about the extent of the involvement.

But increasingly, over the past year, the Soviet press's war coverage has changed from articles on weapons-cleaning contests and daily life in the field bakery to celebrations of heroes and sacrifice and increasing analogies to the Great Patriotic War (World War II). “They are playing it recently much more as a long and glorious struggle against the Afghanistan counterrevolution,” says one U.S. government analyst.

The reason is that even in a closed society, the wounds of war—more precisely, the

wounded—can no longer be concealed or explained away. So great are their numbers that Soviet news managers have been obliged, in their own crude way, to develop a new public-relations approach.

With increasing frequency, Soviet newspaper readers are being treated to stirring vignettes about Soviet soldiers grievously maimed in performances of great gallantry. The accounts have simple, one word headings: “Courage,” “Fidelity,” “Duty.” The language is almost childishly romantic.

Efforts to minimize the war's home-front impact are considerable. Soldiers rotated home from Afghanistan, I am told, are posted in remote and underpopulated parts of the country, away from the big cities, where they would come into contact with the most sophisticated segment of Soviet society. The killed-in-action are taken note of publicly with no reference to Afghanistan: “So-and-so died fulfilling his international duty for socialism.” The next of kin must sign an oath, under penalties, not to disclose that their relatives died in Afghanistan.

But the demobilized amputees and paraplegics, appearing in growing numbers, cannot escape notice. That would be reason enough to present them in positive, patriotic terms. But the accompanying effort to identify them with the veterans of the Great Patriotic War suggests something else—a way of preparing Soviet opinion for a protracted Soviet engagement in Afghanistan.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1985]

WITH AFGHAN REBELS: “FOR GOD AND COUNTRY”

(By Arthur Bonner)

JEGDALEK, AFGHANISTAN.—“History tells me,” said the Afghan rebel commander, surveying the ruins of a string of villages from his command post here, “that when the Russians come to a country they don't go back.”

“Only if we fight them will they leave,” he said, adding, “Our sons will fight them until Afghanistan is free.”

The rebel commander, who identified himself as Mohammad Daoud, is a 21-year-old with long black hair who has been fighting the Soviet-backed Afghan Army for five years. He is leader to a band of about 50 men who are entrenched in the caves and ravines overlooking the area, once home to about 5,000 people. His group is one of 10 in the area that call themselves Mujahadeen, or “holy warriors”; almost all of the men in the bands were born in this desert-like valley.

Nearly three months of interviews in Afghanistan and across the border in Pakistan—the West's listening post for the war—make it clear that the ruins of Jegdalek and the men in the hills are a miniature of the situation throughout this country.

More than five years after Soviet forces swept over the border in December 1979 to shore up a crumbling Communist Government, the struggle for Afghanistan is deadlocked, according to Western diplomats and Western European medical volunteers who have traveled extensively within the country.

The Russians, these analysts say, have shown they can bring destruction but so far seem to have failed in the more crucial task of developing either a surrogate army or civilian party officials to seize and hold the ground to which they lay waste.

Jegdalek is about 27 miles southeast of Kabul, the Afghan capital, and a two-day journey by foot and pack horse from the

Pakistan border. The trail leads up and down steep slopes and, at one point, crosses a pass about 6,000 feet high, where the horses' legs sink deep into snow.

TEA AND SWEET MULBERRIES

On a cliffside at the valley's western end, a visitor is served tea and sweet dried mulberries as one rebel fighter, Sayad Hassan, 24, points down to empty houses and terraced fields.

“The middle house was built by my father,” he said. “My family lived on the right and by brother on the left. In about a month we'll plant some potatoes and other vegetables to help feed the Mujahadeen. But we can't plant all our land because there is no fertilizer.”

As an armed guide escorts the visitor eastward down the rock-strewn valley, the drone of a Soviet spotter plane is heard. The guide halts in the shade of some trees. Those on board the plane, he said, “are taking pictures.” He added: “They come over every morning to see what we are doing. If they notice too much activity, they send their bombers.”

What was once the center of Jegdgalek, with municipal buildings, a school and a mosque, is now toppled stone walls and jagged columns of adobe like giant ant hills.

The villages were destroyed about five years ago, the rebels said, and the population moved to Pakistan. The ground is pockmarked with bomb craters, including some 20 feet in diameter and 15 feet deep. It is littered with the debris of war, from large containers that held cluster bombs to fragments of missiles and antipersonnel mines.

The visitor trudges up a slope to talk with a rebel who identified himself as Akhtar and several others as they enlarge a cave in the side of a ravine, using a tiny donkey to carry away the debris. Akhtar, who appeared to be in his early 40's, pointed down to three terraces, about 5 feet wide and 30 feet long, planted with trees.

“That's my garden,” he said. “I planted apple, pomegranate, almond and mulberry trees. We all know where our farms and gardens are and our children know too.”

DESTROYED BY BOMBS

“I had trees down there,” said his cousin, who identified himself as Yassin. He pointed to the left. “But they were all destroyed by the bombs.” He pointed across the ravine to a circle of green distinguishable from the dull brown of the opposite hillside.

“That's a bomb that didn't go off,” he said.

“Last week a helicopter came and fired flares to mark our location. Then a plane dropped four bombs. Three exploded far away but the fourth went right over our heads and landed there without exploding. We decided we needed a deeper hole to be more safe.”

The raids, the rebels said, come once or twice a week.

“If they want our land,” said Yassin, “they will have to meet us here on the ground. If they try we will defeat them.”

The war in Jegdalek has fallen into a pattern, the rebels said. The full roster of guerrillas is about 400. At any one time, they said, half of them are in Pakistan visiting their families in the refugee camps for periods of two or three months.

Why, the men are asked, do they not remain in Pakistan?

“We want our country to be free,” Akhtar replied. “Our wives, our children, our parents would say to us: ‘Go to Afghanistan. Fight the holy war against the Russians.’”

COUNTRY AND RELIGION

For the Afghans the concepts of country and religion seem intertwined. Opposition to the Communists, the rebels said, first arose from the conviction that the Communists are atheists; it took root, they said, long before the actual seizure of power by Nur Mohammad Taraki, chairman of the Communist Party, in April 1978, the first of a succession of Communist leaders in Afghanistan. By the end of 1979 a Soviet backed coup had installed the country's present ruler, Babrak Karmal.

A man who identified himself as Sadullah, 28, is the commander of a band of about 20 men. He was once a student at a school in Sarobi, about 12 miles from Jegdalek, he said.

They sent Communist teachers to our school. Ten out of every hundred students became Communists. They were all sons of rich families. The middle-class families were good Moslems. Six months after Taraki came the teachers told us we should not go to the mosque. They burned a Koran. So we attacked and burned the school as a "Communist center."

"I was 14 when Taraki came," said Mr. Daoud, the young leader of the largest band. "A priest said to me that Taraki would bring more Russian specialists and that would not be good for our country. I went with my family to Pakistan. There I got a weapon and came back. When I was 16 I helped blow up a bridge on the Kabul-Jalalabad road."

WILL ZEAL BE ENOUGH?

The rebels exhibit unflagging zeal, but Western and Pakistani military analysts say enthusiasm is hardly enough to overcome their shortcomings. They lack heavy weapons and adequate rations; the analysis also points to the disunity of command in Peshawar, the Pakistani city that is the traditional gateway to Afghanistan.

In addition, the rebels are spread throughout the country in pockets—like the men in Jegdalek—each defending its own farms, villages and tribal or ethnic territories. They stage nuisance attacks on the nearest Soviet base or supply line but are unable to combine for attacks on more distant and more important targets, rebel spokesmen in Pakistan concede.

The men of Jegdalek say they believe they are working toward a more unified opposition. The 10 bands in the region receive supplies from five different political groups but, under the inspiration of Muhammad Anwar, a 31-year-old former teacher of literature at Kabul University, they have agreed to pool their resources and take part in joint attacks. The rebels of Jegdalek say Mr. Anwar is trying to extend this unity to other groups in adjacent provinces.

The rebels here are proud of their unity. When they are gathered at night in a room filled with smoke from a wood fire for a talk about politics and the future, a young man interrupts the discussion:

"We don't fight for the Peshawar leaders," he said. "We fight for God and country and our freedom."

The Afghans accept as an article of faith that God plays an active role in the daily life of those who believe in Him. This belief is reflected whenever doubts are expressed about their methods or their prospects.

"Our God will help us," said one man in the smoky room. "God likes honest and good people and does not like the Russians. We will keep on fighting."

"If only one Mujahadeen is left alive," he said, "he will fight the Russians."●

LET MY PEOPLE GO

● Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, Jews all over the world will begin celebrating the Passover holiday this Friday at sundown. Passover or Pesach is a celebration of freedom for the Jewish people. At the seder, a traditional festival meal, Jewish families will proclaim, "Let my people go."

This phrase is as appropriate today for more than 400,000 Jews who desperately want to leave the Soviet Union as it was for the Jewish slaves in Egypt several thousand years ago. While Jewish families worldwide will gather at the seder, Soviet Jews continue to be regularly harassed, intimidated, prohibited from most religious practices, and even imprisoned on trumped up charges.

Since 1979, when emigration levels from the U.S.S.R. peaked at 51,320, the numbers have declined alarmingly. With the recent change of leadership in the Kremlin and renewed arms negotiations the opportunity for positive change may again be in the air. It is, therefore, imperative that we let the Soviet Government and the Jewish refuseniks know that we continue to care.

Recently, I have become gravely concerned with one particular case which has received little publicity in this country. The case of Ilya and Inna Vaisblit was first brought to my attention by the Student Coalition for Soviet Jewry during their annual visit to Congress earlier this year. In December 1973, Ilya Vaisblit, who calls himself by his Hebrew name, Elijah, applied for an exit visa to rejoin his relatives in Israel. His appeal was denied on the pretext of "state reasons" and all of his succeeding pleas have gone unanswered. Elijah, now aged 66, is a war veteran and completely disabled. His wife, Inna, is a doctor and hopes to resume her medical profession in Israel. They have two sons—Alexander and Eugene. The older, Alexander, is now married, lives in Israel and has a grandson while Eugene, a student, lives with his parents in Moscow.

Elijah retired from his job as a radio electronic engineer in 1973 because of his deteriorating health condition. His visa application was denied on the grounds that he had previous access to classified material that had some defense significance. This is completely unreasonable—Ilya is surely quite harmless to Soviet security. He has written in an appeal for help:

I am desperately ill. My disease is called multiple sclerosis. I am nearly blind now, speak and hear with great difficulty, suffer constant headaches . . . I have been confined to bed for years. I am afraid there is not much time left for me to live. I have never in my life dealt with any secrets. . . I hope that you may kindly grant me your support in convincing the Soviet Government that I don't present any danger to the state.

Today I am adopting this family and will be writing to let them know that we continue to care for their welfare and basic human rights. In the next few days, I shall be writing to the Soviet Government in behalf of the Vaisblit family, urging them to let these people emigrate on humanitarian grounds and as guaranteed by certain international accords signed by their Government. The Helsinki Final Act, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights all guarantee this freedom.

I have previously noted that a record low of only 896 Jews were released in 1984. However, in January and February of 1985, only 149 Soviet Jews were granted visas to emigrate. If these numbers continue, 1985 will set another record low. I call upon the Soviet Government to reverse this trend and once again to "Let my people go."●

PONY EXPRESS

● Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, 125 years ago, on April 3, 1860, Pony Express riders began carrying mail across nearly 2,000 miles of the Nation's rugged frontier between St. Joseph, MO, and Sacramento, CA. Today, Senator EAGLETON and I honor the Pony Express and recognize its prominent place in our Nation's history.

The Pony Express grew out of a frustrated need to carry news more quickly to half a million Americans then living west of the Rocky Mountains. While a packet from Missouri could take weeks to arrive in California, Pony Express riders could deliver the packet in 8 to 10 days.

William Russell, a freight magnate, and Senator William Givin of California devised the plan to transport mail across the Western Plains through a system of horsemen riding in relays. They solicited the cooperation of Mr. Russell's business partner, William Waddell, and the three men financed the project. They named the new business Pony Express. A mere 3 weeks after the idea was first conceived by Mr. Russell and Senator Givin, the Pony Express began operation. That first trip from St. Joseph to Sacramento took 10 days.

Pony Express riders rode at top speed from one station to the next along the 2,000-mile route. When a rider reached a new station, he would leap onto a fresh horse with mail bags in tow. Each man usually rode 75 miles, but if the next rider could not ride, the first rider would continue. Pony Express riders carried the news of Abraham Lincoln's election as President from Fort Kearney, NE, to Fort Churchill, NV, in a record time of 6 days.

Pony Express riders rode day and night through the scorching heat and freezing cold. They usually carried two revolvers and a knife to fend off attacks by Indians and bandits. Despite these many obstacles, the mail was lost only once during the time the Pony Express was in service.

Completion of the telegraph system, which stretched from coast-to-coast, obviated the need for the Pony Express, and it ceased operation on October 24, 1861.

On this 125th anniversary of the Pony Express, we want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the city of St. Joseph—where it all began.●

THE POOR AND OUR NATIONAL BUDGET

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Lutheran Bishops have adopted a resolution calling on Congress and the President to provide adequate budgets for those programs providing income maintenance and support services to those in greatest need. The Bishops' statement offers an important focus in the upcoming debate in Congress on budget priorities as we begin reducing the Federal deficit.

Reduction of the deficit cannot be achieved by focusing solely on those programs which provide some necessary level of support to those who cannot make it on their own. The poor have borne a disproportionate share of the burden of controlling Federal spending. I urge my colleagues to read the Bishops' resolution, which I am inserting into the RECORD and I ask that the resolution be printed in full.

THE POOR AND OUR NATIONAL BUDGET

The nation's fundamental priorities are reflected in the budget choices it makes. This year, the soaring federal deficit makes particularly difficult the decisions on how much revenue our nation must raise and how that revenue is to be spent. Amid the clamor of various groups seeking to protect their own interests, the church must speak clearly on behalf of those at home and abroad whose pressing human needs require not only private charity but also government action.

Our deficit dilemma has no painless solutions. However, the sacrifice required must be distributed in accordance with the ability of individuals and groups to bear it. The allocation of limited resources should be based on a thorough evaluation of the utility and effectiveness of tax breaks, military spending and social programs.

In working for a fair "distribution of sacrifice," budget cuts and tax changes proposed for the 1986 fiscal year should be viewed in their broader context. Programs for the poor, which comprise approximately one-tenth of the federal budget, have been cut proportionately deeper than other programs benefitting all Americans. In addition, while the 1981 tax cut decreased the tax burden of many affluent Americans, persons at or below the poverty line have found themselves paying a greater percentage of their income in taxes. Due to these changes and to the effects of the recent recession, the standard of living of many poor Americans

has deteriorated significantly and their numbers have grown. While voluntary organizations have responded to this increase in poverty, they have not been able to ensure that the needs of the poor—many of them children—are adequately met.

Given the high rate of both unemployment and poverty, we believe that a top budgetary priority should be securing adequate funding for human needs and income maintenance programs, with federal standards ensuring that such funds are targeted to persons in greatest need. We would assert that:

No one in this prosperous country should be forced by economic conditions to go hungry or homeless or lack adequate medical care. Even with current funding levels, federal benefits to poor families are often insufficient to provide adequately for their basic needs. We therefore oppose any further reductions in the programs—the so-called "social safety net"—which provide for the immediate needs of low-income Americans: Food Stamps, Aid to Families With Dependent Children, Medicaid, Supplemental Security Income for the elderly poor, and low-income housing and energy assistance programs. Eliminating cost-of-living adjustments or "freezing" funding levels for these programs will further depress the overall standard of living of low-income families. Given the cuts which have already been made in these programs in recent years, we cannot support such a strategy.

Targeting special assistance to persons with special needs is good short- and long-term public policy. A dollar saved in programs cuts today may result tomorrow in extended health care costs, disruptions in earnings, unemployment and other drains on our economy. For example, the WIC program provides special foods to certain low-income pregnant and nursing women, infants and children. However, even at current funding levels, many persons certified to be at nutritional risk are already being turned away, increasing the possibility of long-term damage to their health. Further cuts would exacerbate this situation. Social services to keep families intact, child nutrition efforts, and health programs addressing the specific needs of low-income children are a crucial investment in our nation's welfare.

Persons with earnings at or below the poverty line should not pay federal income taxes. The 1981 cut in tax rates did little to address the specific needs of the working poor. Failure to adjust for inflation the earned income tax credit and other tax provisions means that the government is taxing away a greater and greater percentage of the dollars which the poor desperately need to provide a minimal living standard. This makes little social sense and should be changed.

Programs which address some of the root causes of poverty should be strengthened and improved. These programs include education assistance for disadvantaged students and communities, job training and legal services. Efforts to reduce the unacceptably high level of unemployment, which is devastating to individuals and families, must be a major commitment of government.

The needs of the poor abroad cannot be ignored. The African tragedy highlights the need for both direct food aid and development assistance in less developed areas throughout the world. The outpouring of donations to deal with famine indicates deep concern over the plight of the hungry abroad. However, the work of our voluntary

agencies complements but cannot replace intentional government action in areas of aid, trade and development.

Our churches assert that the responsibility for addressing the needs of the poor is shared among individuals and institutions at every level of society. Private charity certainly plays an important role in this endeavor, and we encourage our own members to continue responding generously to the growing problems of poverty, both at home and abroad. But in our complex and highly mobile society, meeting the needs of the poor in all localities is beyond the capacity of charitable institutions. The federal government has an appropriate role in meeting immediate needs, as well as addressing the systemic causes of poverty. We value partnership between the voluntary and the government sectors in attempting to assist the poor to participate more fully in our economic life—but we strongly resist cuts in funding which undermine that partnership and seriously reduce the government's role in meeting pressing human needs.

LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

(The Reverend James R. Crumley, Jr., Bishop, Lutheran Church in America.)

The Reverend John Adams, Bishop, Slovak Zion Synod.

The Reverend Thomas L. Blevins, Bishop, Pacific Northwest Synod.

The Reverend Herbert W. Chilstrom, Bishop, Minnesota Synod.

The Reverend Paul E. Erickson, Bishop, Illinois Synod.

The Reverend James A. Graefe, Bishop, Metropolitan New York Synod.

The Reverend Franklin C. Heglund, Bishop, Rocky Mountain Synod.

The Reverend Herluf M. Jensen, Bishop, New Jersey Synod.

The Reverend Harold R. Lohr, Bishop, Red River Valley Synod.

The Reverend Howard J. McCarney, Bishop, Central Pennsylvania Synod.

The Reverend Virgil A. Moyer, Jr., Bishop, Virginia Synod.

The Reverend Edward K. Perry, Bishop, Upper New York Synod.

The Reverend Gerald S. Troutman, Bishop, Southeastern Synod.

The Reverend Harold S. Weiss, Bishop, Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod.

The Reverend Robert S. Wilch, Bishop, Wisconsin—Upper Michigan Synod.

The Reverend Royall A. Yount, Bishop, Florida Synod.

The Reverend Dennis A. Anderson, Bishop, Nebraska Synod.

The Reverend Herman W. Cauble, Bishop, South Carolina Synod.

The Reverend Edelmiro Cortes, Bishop, Caribbean Synod.

The Reverend Roger J. Gieschen, Bishop, Central States Synod.

The Reverend Lawrence L. Hand, Bishop, Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod.

The Reverend Raymond A. Heine, Bishop, Michigan Synod.

The Reverend Ralph A. Kemski, Bishop, Indiana-Kentucky Synod.

The Reverend Kenneth R. May, Bishop, Western Pennsylvania-West Virginia Synod.

The Reverend Michael C.D. McDaniel, Bishop, North Carolina Synod.

The Reverend Stanley E. Olson, Bishop, Pacific Southwest Synod.

The Reverend Kenneth H. Sauer, Bishop, Ohio Synod.

The Reverend Philip L. Wahlberg, Bishop, Texas-Louisiana Synod.

The Reverend Paul M. Werger, Bishop, Iowa Synod.

The Reverend Harold R. Wimmer, Bishop, New England Synod.

The Reverend Morris G. Zumbun, Bishop, Maryland Synod.

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH

(The Reverend David W. Preus, Presiding Bishop, The American Lutheran Church)

The Reverend Darold H. Beekmann, Bishop, Southwestern Minnesota District.

The Reverend L. David Brown, Bishop, Iowa District.

The Reverend Lowell O. Erdahl, Bishop, Southeastern Minnesota District.

The Reverend Robert H. Herder, Bishop, Northern Wisconsin District.

The Reverend E. Harold Jansen, Bishop, Eastern District.

The Reverend Clifford R. Lunde, Bishop, North Pacific District.

The Reverend A.C. Schumacher, Bishop, Southern Wisconsin District.

The Reverend Nelson W. Trout, Bishop, South Pacific District.

The Reverend August E. Wenzel, Bishop, Southern District.

The Reverend David A. Wolber, Bishop, Southeastern District.

The Reverend Bernell L. Boehm, Bishop, Ohio District.

The Reverend Norman D. Eitheim, Bishop, South Dakota District.

The Reverend Wesley N. Haugen, Bishop, Eastern North Dakota District.

The Reverend Reginald H. Holle, Bishop, Michigan District.

The Reverend Gilbert M. Lee, Bishop, Northern Minnesota District.

The Reverend Ehme R. Osterbur, Bishop, Illinois District.

The Reverend Marvin J. Schumacher, Bishop, Western North Dakota District.

The Reverend Wayne E. Weissenbuehler, Bishop, Central District.

The Reverend Norman G. Wick, Bishop, Rocky Mountain District.

ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCHES

(Will L. Herzfeld, Bishop, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches)

The Reverend Walter W. Grumm, Bishop, Pacific Regional Synod.

The Reverend Rudolph P. F. Rasmeyer, Bishop, East Coast Synod.

The Reverend Harold L. Hecht, Bishop, English Synod.

The Reverend Robert H. Studtmann, Bishop, Southwest Regional Synod.●

THE UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD COURT

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, last month, two articles appeared on the subject of the U.S. actions in Central America and the use of international law: one written by Richard N. Gardner, professor of law and international organization at Columbia University; and the other, by Alfred P. Rubin, professor of international law at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University.

Professor Gardner notes that our Government, by walking out of the proceedings of the World Court, acted in an "un-American" way, flouting our long tradition of advancing the rule of law among nations. The United States

not only lost an opportunity to argue its case for supporting the Nicaraguan insurgents but, perhaps more importantly, impugned the integrity of the Court by imagining it to be politically biased against the United States.

Professor Rubin correctly observes that it is in the best interests of the United States to consult with international lawyers as part of the decision-making process, rather than using lawyers to justify policies that make little legal or moral sense.

I commend the articles by Professors Gardner and Rubin to my colleagues, and ask that they be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The two articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 22, 1985]

IT WAS WRONG TO DUCK THE WORLD COURT (By Richard N. Gardner)

"Realists" as well as "jurisprudes" have reason to question the Reagan administration's refusal to participate further in the case Nicaragua has brought against us in the International Court of Justice. Our national security is best served by strengthening, not weakening, those few international institutions that can promote stability and order in international relations.

Walking out of a proceeding before an international tribunal that finds it has valid jurisdiction over us is also profoundly un-American behavior. Our founding fathers and leading statesmen throughout our history have believed the U.S. has had moral as well as practical reasons for advancing the rule of law among nations.

In 1946, with the overwhelming support of both political parties, including such conservative Republicans as Arthur Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles, we accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. Since then every Republican and Democratic administration until this one has seen a strengthened World Court as a useful vehicle for developing sensible rules of international behavior.

The "covert" aid to Nicaragua insurgents that the Reagan administration began in 1981 was a questionable operation on both legal and practical grounds. Having started down this road, however, the administration might have limited its international liability by terminating our acceptance of the World Court's compulsory jurisdiction or adding a reservation to it for cases involving armed conflict or national security. Whether by design or by inadvertence, it failed to do so.

It was thus in the awkward position of filing a modification of our acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction just three days before Nicaragua brought its case against us last spring. It did this in the face of a requirement of six months' notice, which the Senate approved in 1946 in order, as it said, to ensure that we would not change the nature of our obligation "in the face of a threatened legal proceeding."

The U.S. did raise some legally significant objections to the court's jurisdiction. But the fact is that every one of the court's judges except the American judge found some basis for jurisdiction. Among them were distinguished jurists from Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, Brazil and Argentina, none of whom can by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as politically biased against us.

It is therefore both unconvincing and unfortunate for the administration to impugn

the integrity of the court by charging that it was "determined to find in favor of Nicaragua" and that it is in danger of becoming "more and more politicized against the interests of the Western democracies." While the political independence of some of the court's judges is open to question, the court's composition is essentially the same today as it was in 1962 and 1980 when our country successfully invoked its support in the peacekeeping-expenses disputed with the Soviet Union and the hostage case with Iran.

Nor is it convincing for the administration to argue that the court overstepped its powers because our controversy with Nicaragua is "political," involves armed conflict, and touches the inherent right of self-defense. Article 33 of the United Nations Charter clearly specifies that the court may deal with the legal aspects of political controversies, as it did in the hostage and peacekeeping-expenses case. The U.S. has brought seven cases before the court involving armed attacks on American military aircraft. And our country has repeatedly and properly argued that national claims of self-defense raise issues of international law that can be reviewed by international bodies.

If we have a really convincing factual and legal basis for our support of Nicaraguan insurgents on the ground of collective self-defense, as the administration believes, we should have been prepared to present it to the court, and our failure to do so cannot be justified on the ground that our evidence is "of a highly sensitive intelligence character." We did, after all, show satellite photographs of Soviet missile sites to the Security Council in 1962 when it was necessary to mobilize world support for the Cuban quarantine.

In short, we should have proceeded to argue the merits of our case, joined by El Salvador and Honduras, which have the right to intervene now and be heard, as the court itself has confirmed. The factual and legal complexities would have been so great as to delay a final court judgment for many months, perhaps a year or more. We could have used that time to negotiate through the Contadora process an end to both our intervention in Nicaragua and Nicaragua's intervention in El Salvador and Honduras.

The administration's walkout from the court signals, instead a determination to continue our support for the Nicaraguan insurgents despite the formidable legal and political consequences. In the process we will have undermined both the World Court and the reputation of the U.S. as a law-abiding nation.

[The Boston Herald, Mar. 5, 1985]

U.S. AID TO CONTRAS VIOLATES LAW REAGAN ADMINISTRATION HEADED ON DANGEROUS COURSE IN CENTRAL AMERICA (By Alfred P. Rubin)

For several years the United States has been supporting military efforts by the so-called "contras," to disrupt efforts of the increasingly repressive Sandinista government of Nicaragua to consolidate its power. The contra effort has been successful to the extent that it has greatly increased Sandinista reliance on support from Cuba and other countries, Communist or not, like Libya, and has virtually united the general population of Nicaragua against us as the intermeddling outsiders.

The United States has been asserting that increased reliance on countries with whose

policies we generally disagree has increased the threat from Nicaragua, and justifies further action by the U.S.

This line of logic has not seemed very convincing to the Congress, which must authorize the expenditure of taxpayers' money. After attempts to avoid turning the Nicaraguan population against us by making our aid covert failed, a search began for moral and legal rationales for overt intervention.

The administration's original assumption that covert operations can be carried out without regard to legalities, while false in the long run, had some support in the Congress. But overt operations need a rationale that can satisfy taxpayers and other constituent groups. Thus the law and morality have suddenly become important issues.

Legally, the situation seems clear. Our military involvement, even if only to give assistance to others is illegal unless there is a self-defense emergency. Even then, we are pledged by our adherence to the United Nations Charter, which is a treaty as solemn as any, to report to the UN Security Council immediately on taking any such self defense measures. We have not made any such report.

Other possible legal justifications for the use of force, as in wartime, are ruled out legally by commitments to collective action through the United Nations or the Organization of American States, which we have ignored. President Reagan has asserted that our support for the contras is consistent with the UN Charter and the Charter of the Organization of American States, but has not, in fact, addressed the legal questions.

Normally, the rules of law already incorporate the elements of morality that lawmakers think ought to be included in the rules. But occasionally it might appear that the rules of law are too rigid for realistic application and that a higher set of moral rules ought to apply instead. The administration seems to be arguing now that our assistance to the contras would be consistent with those higher rules.

One basis for this argument is that the contras represent "freedom" while the Sandinistas represent repression. Since nobody knows what the contras actually represent at this time other than opposition to the Sandinistas, this is a difficult argument to follow. Some contra leaders seem open to democratic evolution; they are sure to be challenged for the leadership of Nicaragua, if the Sandinistas are overthrown. In any case, given the history of Nicaragua, it is doubtful that a sudden change of governmental elites would bring about a quick shift to an ideal constitution.

Another argument is somewhat more subtle. It depends on analogies between the contras today and the Free French under General de Gaulle, or the United States under the Second Continental Congress assisted in its fight for independence by France and by individuals from many European countries, such as Lafayette, Baron von Steuben (Prussia), and Thaddeus Kosciuszko (Poland). The analogies seem wholly misplaced.

In fact, we did not support General de Gaulle against the Vichy Government of France; a fact that caused de Gaulle considerable difficulty and which he resented to the end of his days. We did support him against Germany, our common enemy. But who is our common enemy with the contras in Nicaragua? As far as I know we are not at war with Nicaragua, Cuba or any other country playing games there. In retrospect, our careful refusal to meddle in internal

French affairs was probably correct legally, morally and politically despite de Gaulle's resentment.

In fact, the legal and political result for French activities in support of the fledgling United States was war with Great Britain. Spain also joined the war. By 1780 Russia, the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria, Denmark and Prussia had aligned themselves against the British, and there were skirmishes at sea. At the end of the war in 1783, France got Senegambia in Africa and Tobago in the West Indies for its trouble, and Spain received Minorca and British recognition of her rights to Florida. None of them was fighting for "freedom" for us or anybody else. All had been willing to risk political and legal complications with Great Britain as the result of their meddling in our Revolutionary War, including the risk that their ships would be sunk when carrying arms or other assistance to us. Are we willing to bear similar risks to assist the contras in Nicaragua?

Assuming, as we must, that freedom for ourselves is worth fighting for, would we be fighting for "freedom" for Nicaragua if the result of the fight is that we, not they, determine who becomes their government? We would surely have resented any French or Spanish attempts to dictate our Constitution to us after we achieved independence.

As to individual volunteers, like Kosciuszko, the concepts of neutrality have changed since the 18th century, largely as a result of our own resentment of Confederate raiders getting private help from British firms during our Civil War. Now, our export control regulations entangle the whole country in private ventures however well intentioned, and we held China to the same measure when Chinese "volunteers" fought against us in Korea.

In sum, the administration seems headed in a dangerous direction and its arguments, both legal and moral, seem to lead to a result the opposite of what is being pushed. It might be useful somewhere along the line for the administration to consult a competent international lawyer or two as part of the political decision-making process, instead of asking its lawyers to justify politics that make no legal or moral sense. ●

RULES AND SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS ON COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

● Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, pursuant to rule 26, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on Small Business. These were unanimously adopted by the committee members. The only rule change from the previous Congress is that the chairman and ranking member will no longer be ex officio members of all subcommittees.

Mr. President, I also submit for the RECORD the subcommittee assignments for the Committee on Small Business. The number of subcommittees were reduced from nine to seven. The Capital Formation and Retention Subcommittee and the Government Regulation and Paperwork Subcommittee have been eliminated.

Due to the strong interest of the committee members on the tax simplification proposals and their impact on small business, all small business tax-

related issues will be elevated to the full committee. The Government Regulation and Paperwork Subcommittee will be folded into the Government Procurement Subcommittee.

The material follows:

COMMITTEE RULES

(Adopted on March 28, 1985)

1. GENERAL

All applicable provisions of the Standing Rules of the Senate and of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, shall govern the Committee and its Subcommittees. The Rules of the Committee shall be the Rules of any Subcommittee of the Committee.

2. MEETINGS AND QUORUMS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the first Wednesday of each month unless otherwise directed by the Chairman. All other meetings may be called by the Chairman as he deems necessary, on three days notice where practicable. If at least three Members of the Committee desire the Chairman to call a special meeting, they may file in the Office of the Committee a written request therefor, addressed to the Chairman. Immediately thereafter, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify the Chairman of such request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of such request, the Chairman fails to call the requested special meeting, which is to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of such request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the Office of the Committee their written notice that a special Committee meeting will be held, specifying the date, hour and place thereof, and the Committee shall meet at that time and place. Immediately upon the filing of such notice, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date, hour and place. If the Chairman is not present at any regular, additional or special meeting, the ranking majority Member present shall preside.

(b)(1) Ten Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting any legislative measure or nomination.

(2) Seven Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of routine business, provided that one minority Member is present. The term "routine business" includes, but is not limited to, the consideration of legislation pending before the Committee and any amendments thereto, and voting on such amendments.

(3) In hearings, whether in public or closed session, a quorum for the taking of testimony, including sworn testimony, shall consist of one Member of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(c) Proxies will be permitted in voting upon the business of the Committee by Members who are unable to be present. To be valid, proxies must be signed and assign the right to vote to one of the Members who will be present. Proxies shall in no case be counted for establishing a quorum.

3. HEARINGS

(a)(1) The Chairman of the Committee may initiate a hearing of the Committee on his authority or upon his approval of a request by any Member of the Committee. The Chairman of any subcommittee may, after approval of the Chairman, initiate a hearing of the subcommittee on his authority or at the request of any member of the subcommittee. Written notice of all hear-

ings shall be given, as far in advance as practicable, to Members of the Committee.

(2) Hearings of the Committee or any subcommittee shall not be scheduled outside the District of Columbia unless specifically authorized by the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member or by consent of a majority of the Committee. Such consent may be given informally, without a meeting.

(b)(1) Any Member of the Committee shall be empowered to administer the oath to any witness testifying as to fact if a quorum be present as specified in Rule 2(b).

(2) Any Member of the Committee may attend any meeting or hearing held by any subcommittee and question witnesses testifying before any subcommittee.

(3) Interrogation of witnesses at hearings shall be conducted on behalf of the Committee by Members of the Committee or such Committee staff as is authorized by the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member.

(4) Witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file with the Clerk of the Committee a written statement of the prepared testimony at least 24 hours in advance of the hearing at which the witness is to appear unless this requirement is waived by the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member.

(c) Witnesses may be subpoenaed by the Chairman with the agreement of the Ranking Minority Member or by consent of a majority of the Members of the Committee. Such consent may be given informally, without a meeting. Subpoenas shall be issued by the Chairman or by any Member of the Committee designated by him. Subcommittees shall not have the right to authorize or issue subpoenas. A subpoena for the attendance of a witness shall state briefly the purpose of the hearing and the matter or matters to which the witness is expected to testify. A subpoena for the production of memoranda, documents and records shall identify the papers required to be produced with as much particularity as is practicable.

(d) Any witness summoned to a public or closed hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing, who shall be permitted while the witness is testifying to advise him of his legal rights.

(e) No confidential testimony taken, or confidential material presented to the Committee, or any report of the proceedings of a closed hearing, or confidential testimony or material submitted voluntarily or pursuant to a subpoena, shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee.

4. AMENDMENT OF RULES

The foregoing rules may be added to, modified or amended: provided, however, that not less than a majority of the entire Membership so determine at a regular meeting with due notice, or at a meeting specifically called for that purpose.

SUBCOMMITTEES

URBAN AND RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (2:1)

Mr. D'Amato, Chairman.
Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Dixon.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT (3:2)

Mr. Nickles, Chairman.
Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Rudman.
Mr. Levin.
Mr. Sasser.

PRODUCTIVITY AND COMPETITION (2:1)

Mr. Gorton, Chairman.

Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Bumpers.

INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY (3:2)

Mr. Rudman, Chairman.
Mr. Tribble.
Mr. Gorton.
Mr. Boren.
Mr. Kerry.

EXPORT PROMOTION AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT (4:3)

Mr. Boschwitz, Chairman.
Mr. Kasten.
Mr. Pressler.
Mr. Tribble.
Mr. Baucus.
Mr. Nunn.
Mr. Harkin.

SMALL BUSINESS: FAMILY FARM (3:2)

Mr. Pressler, Chairman.
Mr. Nickles.
Mr. D'Amato.
Mr. Nunn.
Mr. Levin.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SPECIAL PROBLEMS FACING SMALL BUSINESS (3:2)

Mr. Kasten, Chairman.
Mr. Boschwitz.
Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Sasser.
Mr. Baucus.●

JAMES T. HICKEY

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow Senators and to the rest of the country the work of James T. Hickey, a Lincoln scholar from the good State of Illinois.

In November of last year, Jim Hickey retired from his post as the curator of the Lincoln Collection of the Illinois Historical Library where he had served with distinction for 26 years.

During those years Jim's work has added immeasurably to our Nation's understanding of the life and times of Abraham Lincoln.

So as to share the story of Jim Hickey's contributions to the understanding of our Nation's history, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this article about him which appeared in the Winter, 1985 issue of the Lincoln Newsletter. I ask that the article be printed in full.

The article follows:

[From the Lincoln Newsletter, Winter 1985]

HICKEY RETIRES

(By Paul Beaver)

James T. Hickey—James T. Hickey, Curator of the Lincoln Collection of the Illinois Historical Library, retired from his post on November 27. His tenure as curator spanned 26 years from 1958 until his retirement on Nov. 27.

Your author has often said that in his opinion, "no one in the Lincoln field knows more about the day-to-day life and activities of Abraham Lincoln than does Jim Hickey."

James T. Hickey was born in Elkhart, Illinois at Pine Lodge Farm where he and his wife Betty still reside. Jim's great-grandfather William came to America just prior to the American Civil War. This Hickey was an overseer of sorts for William Scully, the owner of more farmland in the 19th century

than any other man (28,000 acres in Logan County and over 200,000 acres in the mid-west).

Historic Elkhart Hill with reminders of Governor Ogelsby, early Logan County settlers and Indians, was Jim's favorite haunt while a boy. His love of history was kindled on this place.

Jim Hickey graduated from Elkhart High School in 1941 with a strong, well developed interest in history in general and Abraham Lincoln in particular.

A college career at Western Illinois University was cut short by Pearl Harbor. Early in 1942, James T. Hickey became a member of the Air Force. He was assigned to the 20th Division Photographic Squadron. This group photographed the Atomic Bomb attacks on Japan.

Jim was also on duty and received the telegram (to be passed on to the bomber command) from President Truman to "Drop Bomb."

Back from service in 1946, Jim entered Lincoln College and graduated in June 1947.

For the next decade Jim and Betty farmed the home farm while he began to pursue his quest for Abraham Lincoln during the winter months.

Few County Courthouses in Central Illinois escaped his scrutiny. "Jim Hickey the Farmer Turned Detective," a 1955 *Life Magazine* article would label him. Jim always credited his relationship with Logan County Judge Lawrence B. Stringer for help and encouragement in his Lincoln study.

In 1911 Judge Stringer published his "History of Logan County." This work related many of the stories told him by early Logan County settlers concerning Lincoln's activities in the county. These were the stories discussed by the Judge and young Jim Hickey.

In 1953, Lincoln, Illinois celebrated its Centennial year. Jim Hickey and Dr. Raymond Dooley, President of Lincoln College were historians for the event. Highlights of the occasion was the restoration of the postville courthouse on its original site.

In 1954, Jim Hickey made a major Lincoln discovery in the attic of the Marine Bank in Springfield, he found the dusty records of the Bunn Capitol Grocery; the Robert Irwin Ledger (Irwin General Store in Springfield) which contained Lincoln's personal household accounts and bank accounts for the years 1840-1850. (This discovery was the basis of the *Life Magazine* story.)

In the late 1950's early 1960's, Jim assisted then Lincoln College President, Raymond Dooley (a Lincoln scholar in his own right) in reorganizing the Lincoln Museum in the basement of the ill-fated administration building. (The building was destroyed by fire in January, 1969 with only the museum surviving.)

Jim taught the Life of Lincoln course at the college while serving as museum curator.

In 1958 Jim's life and career began to change. In that year the Illinois State Historical Library was reorganized. The Lincoln Collection, started by Gov. Henry Horner in the 1930's was set up as a separate department and in 1958 James T. Hickey became its first, and to date, only curator.

In 1959, Jim was named Historical Consultant to the enormous task of restoring the Old State Capitol in Springfield, Illinois. The historical accuracy to which the building was restored is a tribute to work done by Jim Hickey. Many have said that if Lincoln were to return today he would feel very much at home in the building.

The Capitol project led to the restoration of the Lincoln-Herndon law offices across the street from the capitol, the Great Western Railroad Station in Springfield (The site of Lincoln's farewell address), the Governor's Mansion in Springfield and finally the boyhood home of President Reagan in Dixon, Illinois.

All of the above and more found Jim Hickey in charge as historical consultant or as an adviser. These restored works stand as masterpieces to Jim Hickey's quest for historical accuracy, style and grace.

Today Jim Hickey still devotes time to his alma mater, Lincoln College. His is Vice-Chairman of the Lincoln College board of trustees and chairman of the Heritage Committee for the board.

While Jim Hickey is leaving his job as curator in Springfield he is far from "retiring." As Jim has said, "there is a long list of things that I want to do now that I will have a little more time." One has the feeling that he will be as busy as ever.

Jim Hickey stands as an outstanding example of what may be accomplished by setting a goal and with great interest and hard work—bring all that to pass and more. Jim's position among the foremost rank of Lincoln scholars is firmly established. All that lies ahead will only add luster to that shining accomplishment.●

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, pursuant to rule XXVI(2) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 99th Congress as adopted by the committee on March 29, 1985.

The rules of the committee follow:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS

(1) The committee shall hold its regular meeting on the first Thursday of each month. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he deems necessary to expedite committee business.

(2) Each meeting of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a portion or portions of any such meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by record vote in open session of a majority of the members of the committee present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such portion or portions—

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(c) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(d) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement; or

(e) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person.

II. QUORUMS

(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this section, a quorum for the transaction of committee business shall consist of not less than one third of the membership of the entire committee: Provided, that proxies shall not be counted in making a quorum.

(2) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum for reporting budget resolutions, legislative measures or recommendations: Provided, that proxies shall not be counted in making a quorum.

(3) For the purpose of taking sworn or unsworn testimony, a quorum of the committee shall consist of one Senator.

III. PROXIES

When a record vote is taken in the committee on any bill, resolution, amendment, or any other question, a quorum being present, a member who is unable to attend the meeting may vote by proxy if the absent member has been informed of the matter on which the vote is being recorded and has affirmatively requested to be so recorded; except that no member may vote by proxy during the deliberations on Budget Resolutions.

IV. HEARINGS AND HEARING PROCEDURES

(1) The committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 1 week in advance of such hearing, unless the chairman and ranking minority member determine that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date.

(2) A witness appearing before the committee shall file a written statement of his proposed testimony at least 1 day prior to his appearance, unless the requirement is waived by the chairman and the ranking minority member, following their determination that there is good cause for the failure of compliance.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(1) When the committee has ordered a measure or recommendation reported, following final action, the report thereon shall be filed in the Senate at the earliest practicable time.

(2) A member of the committee who gives notice of his intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of final committee approval of a measure or matter, shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days in which to file such views, in writing, with the chief clerk of the committee. Such views shall then be included in the committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusions shall be noted on the cover of the report. In the absence of time notice, the committee report may be filed and printed immediately without such views.●

SAVE OUR SOIL

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, Patrick Henry's statement 200 years ago that, "He is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies," foretold not only the magnitude of soil erosion problems, but the difficulty of dealing with them effectively.

Mr. Henry was writing about farms in Virginia that were being washed away by the swift action of rain on soil unsuited to cultivation. Dense forests had flourished in these soils and so had crops for awhile, but extended use for crops eventually brought ruin to the land and the farmer.

Today, we continue to plow land that should never be plowed, but the types of erosion and the variety of problems we experience from erosion vary greatly from his day. I doubt, for example, that Mr. Henry could have ever envisioned soil erosion being the cause of dark clouds that would one day envelop half a continent or the clogging of mighty waterways running the length of the country.

The solutions remain intractable as ever. Soil erosion is both a natural occurrence and one accelerated by man. At the same time, it is the source of the Nation's food and much of its wealth, so its cultivation has often been encouraged over its conservation.

Yet, though we can probably never eliminate all soil erosion and all its harmful affects, there are ways to lessen the damage. We can save our soil and eat, too. We can separate those lands whose soils are least able to sustain crops and most susceptible to damage from those that are suited to cultivation.

That is why I recently reintroduced legislation I have sponsored in each of the last 5 years to adjust our Federal farm programs so they no longer provide an incentive for the cultivation of our most fragile lands.

I believe the need for this legislation is just as important today as the day I first proposed it. In just the last 4 months over 4 million acres in the Great Plains have been damaged by wind erosion. On another 200,000 acres where the land was not damaged, the crops were damaged by windblown particles.

Patrick Henry's quote appears in a September 1984 National Geographic article, entitled "Do We Treat Our Soil Like Dirt?" that I would like to submit for the RECORD. I believe this article provides a good overview of the diversity of soil erosion problems existing in the Nation depending on a particular region's soils, crops, and farming practices, climate, and geography.

The article follows:

[From the National Geographic, September 1984]

DO WE TREAT OUR SOIL LIKE DIRT?
(By Boyd Gibbons)

In 1931, as the Depression strangled the economy, drought began baking the Great Plains. On April 14, 1935—Black Sunday—a clear, warm day suddenly grew chill as a dark curtain of rolling dust advanced across the plains. Behind it came Robert Geiger, an Associated Press reporter, whose story about the "dust bowl" would forever brand the southern High Plains. For almost a decade, the longest drought in memory, the plains cooked and blew, dusting ships 300 miles out in the Atlantic.

Harold Hogue returned from a visit in Oklahoma to his wheat farm at Dalhart, Texas. "It looked like a desert. That wheat was dead. I climbed over the fence and got one hell of a shock, there was so much electricity in the air from the dust storms."

Hogue lived in a shack wallpapered with cardboard, its window a truck windshield. "The first norther come right through the one-by-twelves. My quilt was covered. If I was on the tractor, my eyes would ball up with mud until I couldn't see the furrows."

When Hogue told me this, I was sitting in the living room of his spacious home looking out at his tennis court. From everything I had read of what the 1930s had done to the upper Panhandle of Texas, I expected Dalhart to be tumbleweeds and steer skulls. But Hogue's neighborhood of wealthy farmers could have been lifted out of Beverly Hills.

He had hung on through the drought, plowing for others and putting his earnings back into land no one else wanted. He dragged railroad rails over the dunes and moved dirt for 20 years, gradually leveling his fields. Wary about dryland farming, he drilled down to water trapped in the vast Ogallala aquifer during the Pleistocene. He now irrigates 20 verdant square miles of wheat, sorghum, and pheasants. His pumps run on natural gas. He winters in Palm Springs. His pickup is a Coupe de Ville.

Roughly half the irrigated land in the United States is in the Great Plains, most of it watered from the Ogallala. The Sand Hills of Nebraska lie over its deepest part, though shallow beds of the aquifer reach far down the Texas Panhandle. Irrigation grows lush plants, giving organic matter to soils that once got it from shortgrass prairie. As long as the Ogallala holds out, the soil will be enriched. But Hogue is not sanguine about the Texas end of the aquifer and the costs of pumping.

"A lot of people say we'll never have another Dust Bowl. The hell we can't. With the price of natural gas, we could be back to dryland farming soon. A lot of farmers already are. You have to have moisture to tie this soil together. If not, it's just like White Sands. It'll blow."

From all the soil erosion stories I had read recently, it seemed that the corn belt was pouring into the Gulf of Mexico and the Great Plains were blowing away. Reporters would troop down to the delta, peer into the muddy Mississippi, do some quick calculations, and announce how much of Iowa or Illinois had just been sent to the sea by farmers. As Bob Ruhe drove me across the corn belt, I asked him what he thought of this man-made disaster.

"That's bull!" he shouted, pounding the steering wheel. "Most of the stuff is still in the watershed, at the bottom of the hill." Bob Ruhe is geologist, a geomorphologist, and the acerbic Yahweh of soils and land-

scape evolution in the Midwest. He is a lean man, tightly wound, his hair short and white, and his assertions vehement. He sets his alarm by geologic time. "I *wirthe* when I hear 'man-caused erosion,'" he said. "That's dogmatic and misleading. Erosion in the Midwest during the past 10,000 years has been incredible—far higher than anything man caused. Sure you can see bad examples of guys mistreating the land. But to generalize from that is false."

Erosion may seem a rather straightforward problem, but soils are complicated, and between the apocalypse and Ruhe lies much conflicting opinion. With some exceptions, erosion gradually depletes soils, and eroding cropland may be costing the country nearly a billion dollars each year in polluted and sedimented rivers and lakes. Soil erosion is serious, but not everywhere and not for the same reasons.

Not until 40 years after the Dust Bowl did the U.S. Soil Conservation Service (SCS) begin to determine systematically how much soil is eroding in the United States. The SCS estimated that in 1977 we "lost" about three billion tons of soil from fields under the plow; roughly two-thirds of it washed, the rest blew. But where it goes and how much its departure damages soil productivity, no one knows with much confidence.

I asked M. Gordon Wolman, an eminent geomorphologist at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, how much we should care. "It depends on where in the U.S. you are and whether your time scale is long or short," he said. "Agriculture has perhaps doubled the rate of geologic erosion, but, as Ruhe indicates, you have to be careful what area of the country you talk about. In places we have made a mess of it, but for the U.S. as a whole, erosion is not killing us. Could it? Probably not. Is it important? In some places absolutely."

The 1977 SCS estimates showed that erosion in this country was patchy. Texas alone accounted for one-fifth of all cropland erosion. Rates well beyond what the SCS believes soils can tolerate were confined to about 10 percent of the landscape: the High Plains of Texas, the Palouse Hills of eastern Washington, and the silty hills bordering the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers from western Iowa almost to the Gulf.

On the Great Plains, speculators and hard-pressed ranchers have been plowing up hundreds of thousands of acres of fragile grasslands to grow wheat—more than half a million acres recently in eastern Colorado alone. These soils easily blow when it's dry, and prolonged drought on the plains, like the one that led to the Dust Bowl, is only a matter of time.

Farmers helped aggravate erosion when they leaped suddenly into the export business. In 1972 massive sales of American grain to the Soviet Union sent prices soaring, and by the end of the decade the value of U.S. farm exports had jumped more than fivefold. A third of our croplands now produce for markets overseas. Chasing the price of grain, farmers plowed up an additional 60 million acres in the 1970s, much of it once protected beneath grass, some of it steep and erodible.

Few farmers still kept livestock, so they stopped rotating their fields in pasture and hay and grew erosive soybeans and corn year after year. And from the factories had come big iron: 16-row cultivators and moldboard plows, and monster discs. No longer a modest red tractor with a coil spring under the seat, the wind up your shirt, and the

manure spreader flinging chunks past your ears, but a four-wheel-drive behemoth with a wraparound cab, Loretta Lynn on the tape, and enough horsepower to plow straight up hills. Big gear didn't run easily on contours, and terraces built to slow erosion got in the way. Earl Butz, then secretary of agriculture, urged farmers to plow "fencerow to fencerow," but they even plowed out the fencerows, the terraces, almost everything but silos. So-called clean farming set a lot more soil on the move.

But where did it go? "We soil scientists ought to hide our heads in shame," William Larson, head of the soils department at the University of Minnesota told me. "We had all this data on erosion losses, but we didn't know what it meant. I'm trying to get that word 'loss' out of my vocabulary. Soil isn't lost as such. Very little of it leaves the immediate landscape."

Erosion has been lowering the mountains and cutting and filling the valleys since the first raindrop hit the ground and the wind began to blow. When erosion gets spectacular, as in the Grand Canyon, we enshrine it as a national park and go downstream to farm the sediments. The Mississippi River pours more than a quarter of a billion tons of sediment each year into the Gulf of Mexico. Undoubtedly, some of Iowa's topsoil is in that cocoa, but it's difficult to trace sediment to its source. Luna Leopold, former chief hydrologist of the U.S. Geological Survey, says that much of that sediment comes from easily erodible shales that the muddy Missouri has been hauling off the Great Plains since the Rockies came up.

"It's really the geology and climate that count," he says. "One of the largest sediment producers in the country is the Eel River of California. It's not clear why, because the Eel is covered with redwood forest. Clearcuts don't explain all that sediment, much of which comes from landslides."

You view soil erosion differently depending on where you are in the country. What may be a crisis to an Ozark family only inches from limestone may be only an inconvenience to a farmer in western Iowa on 80 feet of fertile silt. There are upwards of 30,000 different soils in the United States, which give identity to Black Earth, Wisconsin; Redlands, California. Soils thin as crackers, organic mucks that wrinkle the nose, soils of sand, rich alluvial soils, young soils, buried soils, shrinking and swelling clays that tilt telephone poles toward the road like sabers at a naval wedding.

Without soils there would be no grass, no cows, no bread, no us. When we think that man runs the show on earth, we might recall that earth is mostly rock and life only a veneer on it, sustained largely by a sheet of soils derived from and covering the rock. According to physicist J.D. Bernal, life might have fizzled at sea, where it began, had not the first organic molecules found clay crystals to fasten on to, washed there from weathered rock.

"Nature beats up the landscape," says Dick Arnold, director of the soil survey division for the SCS. "But man accelerates it. Soils are important to survival. Let's not beat them up if we don't have to."

Soil begins as rock. Pikes Peak, Half Dome, the bedrock beneath my yard in Maryland, all are soils in embryo. Water is the agent, exfoliating boulders like shell off a hard-boiled egg, running over rock, under it, reducing it to sand, silt, and microscopic particles of clay. Water bathes the rubble in carbonic acid, rearranging the chemistry of

the rock. This releases minerals to be held by clay and organic particles as nutrients for plants.

Most soils are about half mineral, the rest air and water mixed with a little organic matter—the remains of dead animals and plants. At a roadcut a soil shows its profile of A, B, and C, horizons, or what farmers call topsoil, subsoil, and the stuff below (page 371). Organic matter usually accumulates in the A horizon, where seeds germinate. It may not. Below that, B horizon collects clay, iron, and aluminum. The C horizon is weathered rock, the parent material from which soil forms. There are soils that stand this little lecture on its head, for soils are as varied as the rocks, climate, topography, organisms, and length of time that create them.

Bacteria—and rain and lightning—pull nitrogen from the air. Plants take roots, suck up nitrogen and the minerals leached from rock, throw seeds, and die. Worms, ants, gophers move in and rearrange the soil, opening it up and giving it air. Multiplying beyond count, microbes help release nutrients from dead plants for use by live ones by decomposing organic matter into humus, a dark adhesive embracing clay particles, giving topsoil the feel of bread crumbs and the function of a sponge. Roots can now more easily get water and grow. A soil evolves.

Except for mucks like the Sacramento Delta, most soils have little humus, maybe 6 percent under prairie and almost none in the deserts. But humus is far more important than its proportion in soils indicates. By manuring or plowing under a cover crop like clover, a farmer can return nutrients to the soil for his next rotation of corn.

Plants are nourished by inorganic minerals, so the corn doesn't care if nitrogen is converted by bacteria from manure or scattered from a bag of commercial inorganic fertilizer, but the farmer may see the difference in his cash flow. About half our 8.6 billion dollar fertilizer bill is for nitrogen, most of it in the form of ammonia made from air and natural gas, making farmers all the more vulnerable to the volatile prices and politics of oil and gas.

More important, humus helps topsoil hold water against a dry spell, and by absorbing runoff it slows erosion. But left unprotected on a hillside, topsoil gradually gives up its organic glue to a thin sheet of moving water. "As slopes erode," Klaus Flach, an SCS scientist, told me, "you get more runoff and less water infiltrating the soil. Out in those areas of the country where water is critical, the crops get starved. We really saw it in the 1983 drought."

The deserts are fertile because there is little rain to leach away the mineral nutrients. That's why Arizona's Salt River Valley bloomed when it was irrigated, and why salts still plague it. The glaciated Midwest is productive because its soils are young, from rich sedimentary rock, and its climate favored prairie grasses whose mats of roots made deep humus.

Pity the Pilgrims, who stepped ashore to confront a wall of forest and a cruel joke beneath the trees. New England stands on granite. Except for the silted beaver meadows and alluvial valleys like the Connecticut, the glaciers left the colonists only a thin mantle of hilly, stony soil. The Southwest also was of mineral-poor rock, and it had weathered too long in the rain. Save for the river deltas and the limestone valleys, its old soils were largely pooped out before the first ax rang in the forest.

My yard on the rolling Maryland Piedmont of suburban Washington, D.C., is of that tired soil. The rock came up a quarter of a billion years ago, as the Appalachian Mountains rose into the rain and were reduced to hill, the debris washing onto the coastal plain.

For millions of years rain leached minerals from soils of the southeastern U.S. making them acidic and salting the sea. The rain reacted with carbon dioxide to release hydrogenions—the source of acid—that replaced nutrients in the soil. In the arid West, with little rain to leach the minerals, salt crusted on alkaline fields as on the rim of a margarita glass. My azaleas prefer acidic Maryland, but most plants like neither extreme. They seek neutrality.

The colonists opened the Piedmont forest and dropped seeds in the sunlight. Crops did well for a few years, then thinned. Trees could exploit these poor soils by recycling nutrients from dropped leaves back through the roots, but fertility was all in the humus and not in these tired kaolinitic clays. With the trees gone, the humus lost its fuel. Stored fertility went up shoots of tobacco, and, so to speak, up in smoke. Deep gullies crawled up hillsides to tobacco and cotton, subdividing farms. Sediment went downhill like melting sugar, filling streams and swamping bottomlands, provoking Patrick Henry to write: "He is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies." It is no wonder the settlers had an itch to head west.

By the 1930s the Piedmont was eviscerated from Virginia to Alabama, and terraces and contour plowing on clay subsoil seemed like surgery on a red cadaver. Much of the Piedmont has since reverted to forest, and the gullies are difficult to find in the shadows of the pines. "It's not much of a forest yet," said Dick Arnold of the SCS. "It's just holding that landscape together. The Piedmont was unstable and ready to go. We just gave it the nudge and phhhst! It went."

Unlike Piedmont soils that often from out of the rotted bedrock below them, many soils evolve from rock moved from elsewhere, eroded by wind, by glaciers, by running water. The first soils, formed maybe 400 million years ago, are no more. Other soils have come and gone, eroded from hillsides and rearranged with new personalities on fields and river bottoms, only to be covered again by the rising sea or buried beneath new sediment on which yet other soils have taken shape. Louisiana is essentially sediment hauled by the Mississippi from as far away as Montana. Winter lettuce gets its head on the flat Imperial Valley of southern California in soils composed of bits of the Grand Canyon, Monument Valley, and God knows what else the Colorado River dug out of the Rockies and the Colorado Plateau and dumped on the Imperial in layers of sediment three miles deep.

But for moving earth, nothing rivaled the ice sheets and winds of the Pleistocene. For more than a million years, North America bent under the frozen weight of four major glaciations—the Nebraskan, Kansan, Illinoian, and Wisconsin. Each advance of the ice deep into the Midwest pulverized its soft landscape, scattering chunks of Canada in new terrain of accumulated glacial till, making good stuff for soil.

Rivers of gray mud poured from the melting ice. In winter the rivers fell, exposing vast bars of sediment to the wind. Clouds of wind-blown silt fell all over the Midwest as loess, piling up in hundred-foot bluffs near the Missouri and Mississippi. Successive

soils of loess and till weathered during the millennia between the glaciers and were buried with the next advance of the ice. The frosting on the cake is the young Wisconsin till and loess, little weathered in the brief 10,000 years since the ice melted.

These silty uplands are the source of our worst erosion. Naked on a rainy hillside any soil will move, but loess pours off like cream.

It was May, and Bob Ruhe was driving a Chevy Suburban across Illinois on one of his many traverses, examining loess from Mississippi to Minnesota and out to western Kansas. Two of his students from Indiana University followed us in a pickup, a hydraulic soil-coring rig bolted to the bed. Ruhe occasionally wheeled off the wrong interchange, absorbed in what he was saying.

"Everybody ought to thank God for loess!" he shouted. "The breadbasket of the world sits in the middle of the Wisconsin loess and glacial drifts—corn, soybeans, wheat. The most productive soils in the world. If we didn't have this recent glaciation and the loess to bury that old stuff, like the Yarmouth, which is what they're doing in parts of southern Iowa where the loess has thinned. The Yarmouth weathered all the way through most of the Pleistocene. It's shot to hell. Its B horizon is heavy clay up to 12 feet thick. Water perches right on it. And that stuff would be on the ground today if it weren't for the Wisconsin loess."

"See that rise up ahead? That's the border of the Wisconsin drift. Beautiful, just like a layer of cake. It goes all the way to Canada." We drove up the leading edge of the last glaciation, past a shack and cattle pastures. North of Champaign-Urbana on U.S. 74 we were vibrating. The country was flat to the eye but the roadbed was corduroy. An old clay lake bed lay under the loess. Water perched on the clay saturates the loess so that ice heaves up the highway, and our Su-bur-bur-bur-bur-bur-bur.

Loess also covers the Snake River plain in southern Idaho and the wheat fields of the Palouse. Loess laid down on the plateaus of China is hundreds of feet deep. At the end of the Long March, Mao Zedong hid in caves dug in loess.

More than 4,000 years ago the Chinese devised a system of land taxation based on soils, but pedology, the science of soils, is still very young. It was not until late in the 19th century that V. V. Dokuchayev looked out on the A, B, and C horizons of Mother Russia and pronounced that soil formation was strongly influenced by climate. In the U.S., Eugene Hilgard was independently arriving at similar conclusions, relating native plants to soils in the South: beeswax hummocks, buckshot clay, hog-wallow prairies. He showed why soils of the arid West were fertile and how to control alkalinity and salts with gypsum and heavy-flood irrigation.

"In many ways, soils are still a mystery," Dick Arnold told me. "We know some basic physics and chemistry, but we still have a lot to learn about how soils form."

In 1926 Hans Jenny arrived here from Switzerland. For years he occupied Hilgard's chair at the University of California at Berkeley—Jenny is professor emeritus of soils—trying to quantify the factors of soil formation. He might be excused were he to rest on his worldwide scientific reputation and put his feet up on an ottoman. He is not so inclined. Believing that soils highest in organic matter would exist at high altitude near the Equator, he recently climbed up

Mount Kilimanjaro and filled his plastic bags with black soil. The Tanzanians were astonished to see this wisp of a man at 14,000 feet. Hans Jenny was 82.

As with most sciences, pedology is full of pigeonholes and considerable fluttering to specialized roosts. The roosts have been shifting from the field to the blackboard, with a growing use of computers and mathematical models. "Modeling is a sort of fashion," Dr. Jenny said. "We need a lot more conceptual work."

If one of Ruhe's students shies from the mud of fieldwork and begins relying on equations, Ruhe will plop a can of Play-Doh on his desk and tell him to make his model of that. Ruhe would rather be out on the landscape, like a wildcatter, clattering across the Midwest in his truck full of drill pipes, punching the country full of holes.

At a farm in northeastern Iowa, Ruhe's students backed their pickup into a field. The temperature was in the 40s and the wind put an edge on the rain. The first core came out of the hole. Standing at the tailgate, Ruhe laid the plug of mud on a sheet of white butcher paper. He pinched off a gob, smelled it for humus, and rubbed it between forefinger and thumb like a bank teller checking cash, feeling for the grit of sand and the flour of silt, squeezing out a ribbon of clay. As more cores came out, Ruhe wrapped them like salamis, rubbing ribbons of soil, assaying texture in the rain.

Soils have their own internal construction—from silts like flour to clays as tight as sausage—which determines the pore space for roots and water. A sandy soil can be droughty even in the rain. A heavy clay subsoil or impenetrable hardpan will cramp roots or drown them. Farmers prefer a loam—about equal parts sand, silt, and clay and enough humus for a friable texture of crumbs. Loam is soft underfoot. After a day on clay your feet hurt.

Ruhe wiped his hands. "I've preached heresy—the best thing they could do in western Iowa is let those steep slopes erode down on the valleys where the stuff can be farmed. This doesn't mean I wouldn't be scared if I had to farm a heavy clay B horizon."

Landscapes alternate between cycles of erosion and stability. Sediments gradually build up, then the climate changes, the earth uplifts, or man clears the land, and on this unstable landscape the soil begins to move. The Mississippi Valley has had a number of such cycles.

In a big storm, clay and organic particles may go hundreds of miles, yet there are coarse sediments that eroded into the Mississippi Valley 15,000 years ago that still haven't reached the Gulf. The entire Mississippi watershed is storing and moving sediment in obscure stages from a hayfield ditch in eastern Montana to New Orleans.

Arroyos in the Southwest are usually blamed on overgrazing, since shortly after big herds hit the range in the late 1800s gullies began debouching from the foothills like spaces between the toes. The cow was probably the trigger, but the valleys were full of sediment poised to go, just as they had gullied dramatically thousands of years ago when climatic shifts removed vegetation, exposing soil to summer cloudbursts.

Landscapes do not evolve gradually, according to Ray Daniels, former director of soil survey investigations for the SCS. "I think you get them steady by jerks. Most people have no idea how fast landscapes can change. In some cases man-made erosion may be faster, in others slower, than geolog-

ic erosion. Our landscapes are largely shaped by erosion.

"A lot of people want to hold those loess hills in western Iowa forever. You can't. There's been tremendous cutting the past 1,500 years. Sediment helps dissipate the energy of a river. Take sediment out, and the river starts cutting like hell, as the Missouri has done below its dams. In the tropics some of the most fertile soils are from fresh material exposed by erosion. I'm not advocating we erode everything, but I'm also not saying that all erosion is irreversible damage. I don't know of any such thing in soils."

John Peterson, former head of agronomy at Purdue University, is less sure. "No ordinary farmer could afford to reclaim large areas of subsoil," he said. "Even discounting extravagant claims of the doomsayers, we can't afford to lose productive topsoil."

In 1955 a family on the loess hills of western Tennessee hoed 30 acres of cotton. Ten years later one man with big equipment could handle a thousand acres.

"In about 1974 soybeans went up to \$12, and people just went wild clearing land," said Bruce Calhoun, an SCS technician at Union City. "After a few years there isn't enough humus to hold the loess, and the soil just goes. Farmers say, 'I've got to pay for the combine.' I can understand their reasoning, but they're shortsighted."

We drove past eroding fields where farmers had ignored contours and driven their big rigs uphill and down. Road culverts were filling up, and a small dam built in 1963 to trap sediment for 50 years was already choked with silt and box elders.

We parked on a high loess bluff above the Mississippi. Below was Reelfoot Lake, shaped in 1811 and 1812 by the powerful New Madrid earthquakes and silting in from these hills ever since. In 50 years Reelfoot could again be a marsh.

Maury Headden farms near Newbern, Tennessee. He is in his 70s. He breathes life into the dry language of soils classification. Eroded rills are "shoestrings," steep land is "all rolled up." He pointed to a rise in a plowed field—a Typic Hapludalf according to the SCS—and said, "That's good land, yellow poplar ridge ground." A damp depression: "That's buckshot—white gum ground, and it's sticky way down."

We walked down his terraced pasture to a cattle pond by the woods, where silt from neighboring fields had almost buried his fence. "The land back when we was younger grew red clover and made a lot of humus," Maury Headden said. "You don't see that any more. My daddy's farm was level land. He said I'd lose this up here in five years to erosion, and I darn near did. It started to leave as soon as we worked it for cotton. I didn't like terraces, but you've got to have them on this steep ground. I want to leave this ground as good as I found it."

What is excessive erosion? According to the SCS, it is anything over five tons per acre per year on most soils, down to two tons on others. The maximum soil tolerance, or "T-value," apparently evolved from SCS estimates from the 1930s that topsoils deepen an inch in 30 years—five tons an acre each year. Keeping erosion below the T-value supposedly would enable farmers to grow high yields economically and indefinitely. But the scientific basis for T-values remains controversial.

"We just came up with a figure," said Bill Brune, former SCS state conservationist for Iowa. "I don't think any scientist knows how long it takes to generate soil." Re-

search is spotty, but it shows some topsoils deepening an inch in only 15, not 30 years. Yet soils aren't likely to be created at the bottom from unconsolidated material any faster than an inch in 300 years, and a lot slower from hard rock. No farmer is likely to get his erosion rates that low. The five-ton T-value may be too low if it is meant to approximate the formation of topsoil, but it is too high to keep the rooting depth of soils from gradually shrinking. Nor does it take into account the damage done by eroded sediments to streams and lakes.

To Klaus Flach, an SCS scientist responsible for reexamining T-values, "It's a pretty good expression of averages. But I can't prove it. It's intuitive. A lot of loess soils probably aren't hurt all that much by some erosion, but if there's a clay pan exposed, you've got real trouble."

Walter Wischmeier, who developed the equation for measuring water erosion, told me, "A soil tolerance has to be low enough to protect productivity, but it has to be attainable by farmers. A good sod will prevent erosion, but we can't eat grass." To many scientists like Tom Dunne, a hydrologist at the University of Washington, there is little scientific basis for the five-ton T-value. "The mistake," he says, "is to try to give people a warm feeling that preserving soil is good. You've got to find out how erosion is damaging production, if it is."

Unfortunately, it is difficult to isolate what erosion does to soil productivity from all the other variables—weather, fertilizers, the farmer's skill—that influence crop yields. Neil Sampson, a former official with the National Association of Conservation Districts, says, "In my judgment the economics of erosion on soil productivity is serious. The thinner that topsoil gets, the higher the productivity loss for each additional inch that erodes. But you can't prove it with much intellectual rigor. We can't always tell you if the deposited soil is damaging or beneficial, although it is damaging in some cases."

Despite erosion, crop yields have been increasing for years. Scientists believe erosion damage has been masked by technology, particularly the tenfold increase in commercial fertilizer use since World War II.

In shallow soils or in those where erosion has cut the capacity of topsoil to hold water, crops can't be helped by more fertilizer. That's why William Larson, at the University of Minnesota, pays less attention to high erosion rates—and T-values—than to the vulnerability of the soils that remain.

He has compared eroding loess soils of western Iowa with similar ones of western Tennessee and Mississippi. Unlike Iowa, those in Tennessee and Mississippi are often underlain with dense pans that block roots and water. At current erosion rates, Larson estimates that productivity losses in a hundred years could be minimal in western Iowa, but substantial in Tennessee and Mississippi, while the drop in yields nationwide may be no more than 5 to 10 percent.

Farmers know how to control erosion, but soil conservation is still dictated more by economics than by good intentions. In recent years, when fuel, fertilizer, and interest rates headed for the stratosphere, farmers began thinking twice about exercising their big tractors. Instead of burying weeds and crop residues with heavy moldboard plows—and burning a lot of fuel—they could kill weeds with herbicides and drill through mulch with a "no-till" planter behind a smaller tractor.

No-till farming has its drawbacks on colder and poorly drained soils—such as diseases and some lower fertility—so many farmers mulch-till instead with a chisel plow or disc. A wet spring won't delay their planting as much, and the mulch of dead weeds and crop residues holds the soil, and moisture should drought occur. Roughly one-third of all U.S. cropland is now in some form of conservation tillage, and half could be by the turn of the century. During recent years Tennessee's annual erosion rate has dropped from 14 tons an acre to about 10, probably because of reduced fall plowing. Mulch on the fields and less plowing means less runoff and erosion, but farmers are having to lay on more herbicides.

But on those steep loess hills, farmers can't hold soil with only mulch. They also need grassed drainageways and terraces, and that takes bulldozers and a lot more money than most farmers can justify. Unfortunately, such conservation doesn't usually repay a farmer in improved yields what he spent to save soil, at least maybe not for 20 years, and that's a good part of a farmer's productive life. "The farmers around here want to control erosion," an SCS man told me in western Iowa. "They come in and ask for help, but it's a matter of costs."

Iowa puts up conservation funds along with those from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The money never goes far enough, in part because until recently half the federal effort had been spread on soil with low erosion rates. Yet in 1983, with erosion control at a billion dollars, the President's Council of Economic Advisers estimated that federal subsidies to farmers blew right off the chart: from 7 billion to 28 billion dollars in two years. Taxpayers were forking over \$12,000 per farm to subsidize production, and \$400 to hold the soil.

The Reagan Administration and Congress have agreed to target some erosion control where it is needed most—not only where erosion rates are high, but also where shallow soils and hardpans can affect productivity. Peter Myers, chief of the SCS and a grain and hog farmer from southeastern Missouri, told me: "Targeting is causing people to concentrate on erosion where it is worst. Politically it isn't easy. They'd like the money spread around as it always was. We know how to control erosion. But cost effectively? Most soils yes, others no. We need a lot of answers, particularly to show the farmer what he's losing in terms of productivity. The trick is to crack the big-equipment syndrome and get the farmer off that big breaking plow. He's been doing things for years that his father did. When I started conservation tillage, my neighbors scratched their heads. They thought I was being sloppy."

"We've always gone at erosion as a moral issue, but now we also want to appeal to the farmer in dollars and cents. We have to be careful not to paint a distorted picture. Soil erosion is not a today problem; it's a tomorrow problem, but you have to work on it today. Why squander what we have?"

The high plains of Texas appear to have been ironed. When the Rockies first wore down, a slurry of broken mountain washed onto the plains. Winds sifted the fine stuff around and dusted the plains to make soil. The soils still blow. During droughts, sand blows across the fields, shredding crops to confetti and piling up in dunes. The dust of fertile silts, clays, and humus winnows into the sky and moves east.

Water erodes more soil in the U.S. than wind, but one bad High Plains storm can

crater a field. A third of American cotton comes off the dryland fields between Big Spring and Amarillo, Texas, and with it maybe a quarter of U.S. soil eroded by wind. Cotton farmers plow often and deep to bring up clods of silt and clay to hold moisture, but winds suck up the fine particles. Yields keep dropping as the soil gets sandier.

R.C. Thomas, a farmer near Big Spring, told me, "We're cutting our own throats by going cotton all the time, but it's simply survival. A lot of range has been put in cultivation that shouldn't have been. There's no body to our soil. They have all those cornstalks up on the prairie. What I wouldn't give for some of that organic stuff here."

Driving to Seminole with Bill Fryrear, head of the USDA Agricultural Research Service station at Big Spring, I passed fields littered with white rock, where plows had clipped caliche. In dry country, lime leaches down only a few feet, where it hardens like concrete. Hit caliche with a shovel and your elbows ring. In the Central Valley of California—the national grocery—D-9 Cats drag huge breaking plows to fracture similar hardpans of silica. Growers used to blast holes in it with dynamite and plant fig trees. Much of the High Plains of Texas sits on a caprock of caliche as thick as 30 feet. When the soil blows down near that, your next rotation better be oil.

We walked into a cotton field that resembled the Sinai desert. Dunes 15 feet high buried the fences. Farmers have built as many as three fences, one on top the other, as sand covers them up.

"The potential for erosion now is worse than in the 1930's," Bill said, "If it gets as dry as it was in the 1930's, we're in for some real trouble. You're in country now that man in his infinite wisdom did not improve upon."

As a hungry world keeps crowding onto worn-out soils, Americans are fortunate to possess so many good ones. Although we pave fewer than a million acres of farmland each year—not a rate suggesting a national shortage in even the foreseeable future—California continues putting a lot of soil under macadam and Mr. Taco. In a few decades the orange groves of southern California have approached a memory, and the sprawl of Silicon Valley has chased 80,000 acres of prune and walnut orchards east to the Central Valley, where the cost of water continues to rise with the salts.

Soil scientist Roy Simonson suggests that on the whole our better soils have lost some fertility as we have improved the poor ones with fertilizers, so that the weathered coastal plain of the southeastern U.S. now competes with the corn belt.

High costs of labor and land have caused farmers to turn more to science and technology for their high yields, using soils to prop up crops in the sun. In trying to reduce the risks of weather and disease, science and economic pressures have helped encourage a riskier way of farming: away from rotations that hold and restore soil and toward erosive beans and grain for unstable export markets. Although half of America's farmers have almost no debt, many are in serious trouble, heavily mortgaged. These are the guys who lean hardest on their soil.

For all its Byzantine subsidies and distorted markets, American agriculture is no small success, but to maintain high yields will require scientific advances—better plant breeding, maybe perennial grains—and more sophisticated farming. Erosion may not gouge big holes out of soil productivity na-

tionally in the next hundred years, but a century is a short time in the life of a nation. Eventually our descendants may wish we had taken a longer view.

But that doesn't make today's choices obvious. We still know too little about how much erosion is too much. How much money should we spend, and where should it go? Should we continue subsidizing conservation tillage when fuel bills already give farmers incentive to leave the plow in the shed? Is our goal to protect soil productivity, or keep silt and pollutants from getting in reservoirs—and if both, what is an economic use of scarce tax money?

Sodbuster bills now before Congress would deny certain crop subsidies to landowners who plow up erodible range. It makes sense not to pay for dust storms, but some economists doubt that this will stop the plows, when cattle ranchers are desperate and speculators can transform \$100-an-acre rangeland into \$300 wheat fields and walk away with a killing.

There is a nostalgia for the family farm with Pa in the barn milking the brindled cow, and an uneasiness about the trend toward big corporate farms. On the other hand the Piedmont was gullied by thousands of desperate families, and more profitable farms may be better able to afford costly soil conservation. Maybe our nostalgia is for the family, not the farm or its hard life few of us ever led and many willingly fled.

Economics, not nostalgia, governs the plow. The world's appetite drives our production of grain and soybeans; consequently, if exports and prices soar again, another big plow-up of erodible soils of the Middle West is inevitable. Those men on the plows churning up High Plains range are hoping for rain and a few bumper wheat crops to pay off a gamble in country where grass returns slowly and drought holds the cards. "I'm not opposed to people making money," Peter Myers told me, "but I am opposed to another Dust Bowl." ●

EAST SIDE BANK

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on March 24 the East Side Bank & Trust of Chicago will celebrate a milestone in its history. It was 25 years ago on that date that the East Side Bank put down roots in one of Chicago's distinctive far southeast-side communities.

During those intervening years the East Side Bank, under the direction of its president and chairman, Joseph J. Olivieri, has grown through service to its customers and the community from having assets of \$500,000 to more than \$77 million today.

At this time, like those in the community, I congratulate the board of directors of the East Side Bank & Trust Co., President Joseph Olivieri, and the staff on this significant anniversary and I wish them the best in their continued service to their community. ●

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE OF MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor Senate Joint Resolution 101, introduced by my good

friend and distinguished colleague from Michigan, and to voice my outrage over an event which resulted in the slaughter of more than 1 million innocent men, women, and children—the Armenian genocide of 1915. Even though there exists an impressive collection of documents substantiating the Turkish attempt to systematically obliterate the Armenian race, considerable ignorance still clouds this tragic episode.

The Armenian people, who trace their roots back to Noah, settled in the territory around the Caucasus Mountains and the Mediterranean coastal area of present-day Syria. In the fourth century, they became the first country to embrace the Christian religion. Because of its strategic location, Armenia was frequently invaded and its people were forced to comply with the repressive policies of the Turkish Empire. During a single year of the regime of Sultan Abdul Hamid II, more than 300,000 Armenians perished. As tragic as this may seem, it was just the beginning.

In June 1915, the Turks announced a deportation policy to relocate the Armenian people. Armenians were forced to march from the Anatolian highlands to the desert region of eastern Syria.

The decision to undertake this genocide was a conscious one. In 1915, the Turkish Interior Minister Talaat Pasha stated that the Turkish Government was embarking on a conquest to "destroy completely all Armenians living in Turkey." He added, "An end must be put to their existence, however criminal the measures taken may be, and no regard must be paid to age, or sex, or to scruples of conscience."

In their policy of genocide, the Turks gathered entire communities aboard sea vessels, and then drowned them. Live babies were thrown into pits and then covered with stones. Confronted with the threat of death, more than 1 million Armenians were forced to leave their homes and march hundreds of miles, while being denied food and water for the duration of this journey. Hundreds of thousands died from the exhaustion of the march, and hundreds of thousands more from starvation. In all, more than 2 million Armenians were affected by the deportation policy.

Those who survived the genocide fled throughout the world. Many emigrated to parts of the Middle East, Western Europe, and the United States. Others joined Armenians in the Soviet Union, where they founded an independent Armenian Republic in 1918. Unfortunately, the Armenian people were soon subjected to the tyranny of the Soviet regime as well. Today, there are more than 675,000 Armenians living in the United States, many of whom had family members perish in the Armenian genocide. For

the over 1 million innocent men, women, and children who were exterminated by the Turks from 1915-17, we owe a remembrance of this shameful event. The book is not yet closed on the Armenian genocide, one of the greatest crimes against humanity in the history of civilization. This resolution is tantamount to that fact.●

HEALTH CARE COORDINATION ACT

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor the Health Care Coordination Act introduced by my good friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. Although similar legislation was introduced in the last session of Congress, there was not enough time to work out its passage. I hope we will act on this legislation during the 99th Congress.

Over the last several years, health care costs have risen dramatically. Some of the legislative proposals designed to arrest this rapid cost increase have neglected both the beneficiary and the quality of health care. I support S. 780 because it not only addresses the problem of the high and increasing cost of health care, but also because it helps those most adversely affected by these costs, the elderly poor.

The Health Care Coordination Act takes the responsible step of allowing States to implement coordinated programs of acute and long-term care for beneficiaries who qualify for both Medicaid and Medicare. By allowing a combination of Medicaid and Medicare for the first time, the program will be able to provide more services for those elderly who qualify.

The most common complaint about the Medicare program is that it does not cover long-term care. Medicaid accounts for 90 percent of all public spending for long-term care. The Health Care Coordination Act would combine the advantages of Medicaid and Medicare and would remove the perverse incentives that shift costs between the two programs. This will be possible because the States will administer the program. The State or a designated health care provider will be able to offer additional services and, if necessary, require enrollment fees, cost sharing, or premiums with approval of the Secretary of Health and Human Services [HHS]. Neither the States nor any of the 4 million eligible enrollees would be obligated to join this program.

Most importantly, this program will be, at worst, budget neutral. Medicare payments for eligible enrollees would be capped and the States, as administrators, would be required to assure the Secretary of HHS that the Federal Government will not exceed the total costs which would have been incurred by the State and Federal Government

if the program were not in effect. Significant savings will be made by avoiding unnecessary hospitalization. Whereas the average home care or community care stay will cost \$50 to \$60 a day on average, the average cost for a day in a hospital is well over \$200. Billions have been spent on needless hospital stays. This legislation is a rational initiative toward correcting such unnecessary spending.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of S. 780.●

THE VIEWS OF FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

● Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, a recent article in the Rocky Mountain News reflects what several young people in Weld County, CO, who would like to pursue careers in agriculture, believe is the proper course for the future of American agriculture. The following are a few sample remarks:

What we need is a system where supply and demand is allowed to work.

The government should pull out. Just pull out. Nullify all the loans and get out. . . . We should be thinking of future generations.

. . . . When the economy improves, maybe some of those people can get back into farming. We've got to, it's our way of life.

It's (farming) in our hearts, some of us will be farming regardless of the government, the banks, going broke, come hell or high water. I'll be a farmer until the first shovel of dirt is thrown on my grave.

There has been a lot of talk about farm policy this session of Congress, and for the good reason that our farmers are facing such difficult financial problems today. But, while some of us are calling for more subsidies for agriculture, some of the young people who want to spend their lives in farming are calling for Government to get out of agriculture.

I hope Senators will take a moment to review this article entitled, "Young Farmers Critical of U.S. Bailout," from the March 6 Rocky Mountain News.

The article follows:

YOUNG FARMERS CRITICAL OF U.S. BAILOUT

GREELEY.—They are members of Future Farmers of America. In times such as these, the name carries a touch of irony.

Seven members of the future farmers organization at Greeley West High School sit informally around a classroom in the agriculture building. These youths grew up on or around farms and, if the family farm is going to survive, they believe they know what it's going to take.

The things they say might surprise the farmers petitioning for increased federal aid. As the students discuss their future, the debate over federal subsidies for the family farm rages in Washington, D.C., and around the country.

Some of what the students say has been said before . . . at farmers' meetings . . . "Anybody who eats has a vested interest in the future of the American farm."

Says 17-year-old senior Bill Schneider: "All those government people have their ham 'n eggs in the morning." Schneider sees red—as red as the Coors jacket he is wearing—when he talks about money he says the government is wasting on missiles and foreign aid.

But they don't believe a monetary bailout for the farmers is the answer, either.

The students say the sooner government gets out of the farming business the better. They also see good management as an issue farmers must address.

Farmers are caught in the most severe credit crunch since the Great Depression. Their financial problems are highlighted by protests and foreclosure auctions in the Farm Belt and by escalating pressure and rhetoric in Washington.

Bankers say low commodity prices and slow demand for exports have devastated farm income and made it difficult or impossible for some farmers to pay back the high-interest loans they took out during the boom years of the late 1970s.

"Colorado agricultural producers are facing the most severe economic conditions in half a century," John Stencel, president of the Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, says. "We have one generation of farmers moving into retirement, while the next generation may not be able to take up the reins because of the debt crisis."

Nationally, farm income is at its lowest level in equivalent dollars since 1933, yet, according to White House Budget Director David Stockman, the nation is spending more for farm subsidies than for all welfare programs combined.

In the 1930s, at the birth of farm subsidies, almost 30 percent of the U.S. population lived on farms. Today the figure is 3 percent and slipping. Nearly half the people classified as farmers (because they sell more than \$1,000 worth of products a year) have another occupation.

Shawn Beck's great-grandparents moved to Iowa from Germany to find land to farm. When he talks about farming problems, the 18-year-old senior speaks from experience. He talks about President Reagan's pledge to veto a farm-relief bill that Congress has sent to him. "There's a good chance Reagan may be too late. (President) Carter should have done it," he says.

"What we need is a system where the law of supply and demand is allowed to work," says senior Wayne Weber, 17, who is quieter than the others, a listener.

"Another failure was the PIK (payment in kind) program," says senior Ken Wagner, 17. "The farmer set aside the land that wasn't so good anyway and concentrated on the land that was good. He ended up growing even more."

The PIK program was meant to hold down crop surpluses by giving government-owned grain and cotton to farmers in return for their planting fewer acres, as a price-propping measure. A criticism of the program was that PIK paid farmers and corporations for idling "junk land" that produced poor crops in the first place, gave away \$13 billion worth of grain at the taxpayers' expense in the process and did nothing to reduce record grain stores. Much of the money went to large corporations.

In Colorado, wheat planting increased by more than 500,000 acres in 1983 over 1982. A total of 710,637 acres of wheat land was idled by PIK participants, but non-participants increased Colorado's total wheat acreage from 3.35 million acres in 1982 to 3.86 million in 1983.

Quint Karre is a 17-year-old senior with the largest FFA project in the Greeley Agriculture Department. "Under PIK," he says, "the diary where I worked last summer went from 70 to 40 cows, but they culled out all the low producers. They produced even more milk."

"That's why the Canadians are plowing up range land around here," Weber says. "We don't need more wheat land."

Beck agrees, saying the government has set aside a huge supply of grain, and the demand isn't that high.

"Sure, and in 30 years that land they plowed up will be just starting to get back," says senior Geoff Cobb, 18, who talks with rock-hard determination about being a farmer.

Schneider says, "And then add another 30 years because at first that land will only grow weeds, not anything something would eat." Adds Beck: "The gentleman farmer does it as a tax write-off."

Cobb points out it is an investor's game, that investors are buying up land from farmers who are going under.

Karre, who admits the investors' game is killing the farmer, points out there is one good feature—"It helps the livestock industry. They do it as a tax write-off, but it allows them to raise some good stock."

While all of this is happening, junior Lori Hoecher, 16, whose FFA project is raising corn and feeding steers and who also is firm in her commitment to remain in farming, says: "The farmer looks at loans, loans, all their lives, loans. That's where they go broke. All the profits are always used to pay off those loans."

Farmers, the students agree, farm because it is a way of life, but they say every farmer who has made it has paid a "fearful price in hardship."

"I went to Kansas City for a livestock show, and I can't handle being in town," Karre says. "All the constant noise. Most farmers don't even go on vacation, they like the farm." And, they say, they couldn't afford a vacation even if they had the time.

"They've grown up on the farm, spent all their lives there," Hoecher says. "It's all they know."

"What are they going to do when they lose their farm?" Karre says. "They go on welfare."

The bank did foreclose on Beck's uncle. "He was too old, too sick, couldn't make the payments anymore," he says. "But in truth there was bad management, too. He had new tractors and the old ones were still sitting around."

Good management, these students say, is the second biggest issue facing farming, next to getting the government out of farming.

They say the reason they are in FFA is to learn good management. At one point in the discussion Wagner brings out a workbook he is keeping on a hog-raising project, to show how it's done. Computers, they say, are also good management tools, "except they won't go out and put in fence posts for you."

"The only time the government should become involved in farming is in the case of a real emergency, like the Great Depression—and then only until the emergency is over," Beck says. He points out that most of the "emergency" legislation, drafted by President Franklin D. Roosevelt 52 years ago, remains in effect.

"The dust bowl back then was an emergency, but poor farming caused a lot of the problems," Schneider says.

How should the government extricate itself from the farm problem? Beck sums up their thinking:

"The government should pull out. Just pull out. Nullify all the loans out and get out. Sure, they'd lose money on the loans, but they would make it up by not making future loans and subsidies."

The students would throw out price supports and the federal land bank and subsidies and any other form of government aid.

"Write it off, get out," Beck says. "It may hurt us when we pay taxes in the immediate future, but we should be thinking of future generations."

After talking about it, the students say 30 percent to 35 percent of the farmers, the ones with poor management, but luck and marginal farms, would not survive if their plan was adopted and free enterprise took over.

(Even as they talk, in Denver Sen. Alan Simpson, R-Wyo., is telling members of the Denver Forum that the wretched fate of farmers who don't survive "is called capitalism," which allows you to make it or allows you to go broke.)

The students acknowledge their proposed government pullout will be hard, but farming is hard, they say. They know of only one other profession where the work is as hard and the money as scarce. They laugh, and say, "Rodeoing."

These Future Farmers of America believe a free market will reduce the federal deficit and improve the whole economy.

"Then, when the economy improves, maybe some of those people can get back into farming," one says. They believe farmers will survive. "We've got to," Hoecher says, "it's our way of life."

"It's in our hearts," Cobb adds. "Some of us will be farming regardless of the government, the banks, going broke, come hell or high water."

"I'll be a farmer until the first shovel full of dirt is thrown on my grave." ●

RESEARCH GRANTS

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor Senate Joint Resolution 89, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts. This resolution is in response to action taken by the Office of Management and Budget to direct the National Institutes of Health [NIH] to reduce the number of research grants mandated by Congress for this fiscal year. This unwarranted action would have the effect of decreasing the amount of grants from 7,083 to 5,462. Similarly, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration has been directed by OMB to reduce their research grants.

Although the directive is not a deferral, it does require NIH to forward fund enough grantees to use up the money appropriated for fiscal year 1985 while keeping the number of grants awarded at 5,462. This amount is even lower than the 5,493 grants awarded in fiscal year 1984.

During consideration of this fiscal year's budget, the administration agreed to increase spending on biomedical research. I believe research conducted by NIH is one of the most

cost-effective programs we fund. The cost to society of the many disorders that affect our citizens is in the many billions of dollars annually. To eradicate a disease is to wipe away the associated medical expenditures and to increase the productivity of Americans. The United States has the most advanced medical care in the world. This is directly attributed to the fine work of the National Institutes of Health. It is imperative that we continue our strong financial support for this research.

The target of 7,083 new grants was based on independent studies of biomedical research needs. We are making great strides to finding the causes and cures for major debilitating diseases such as diabetes and Alzheimer's disease. To check our progress now will have unfortunate implications in the future. It should also be pointed out that the administration's work to control high health costs are greatly benefited by biomedical research. I fear OMB's directives will undermine our longrun efforts on this problem as well.

For these reasons, I strongly support adoption of this resolution. Congressional support for biomedical research is clear. I urge quick action on Senate Joint Resolution 89.●

FAMILY CARE ACT

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to cosponsor S. 779, the Family Care Act of 1985, introduced by my good friend, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

S. 779 would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit for expenses incurred in the care of elderly family members. The Family Care Act is necessary for both humanitarian and fiscal reasons.

Financially, institutionalized care for the elderly is a drain on Government sponsored assistance programs. It is estimated, however, that up to 40 percent of nursing home residents could live at home. In all too many instances, families are forced to institutionalize their elderly relatives because of financial reasons. This bill would provide tax credits for a portion of expenses incurred for services that the chronically ill elderly and their families require. Such services include home health aide services, adult day care, respite care, nursing care, and medical or health related supplies and equipment.

This assistance will not only provide much needed emotional and financial relief for the families of the elderly ill, it will also save money for the Government. One of the highest expenses in medicare is institutionalized care. Nationwide, such care costs over \$20,000 annually per patient. I believe the savings in medicare costs will far exceed

the revenue loss from these tax credits.

S. 779 is designed to target the greatest relief to those families most in need. The credit will be determined on a sliding scale based on annual income. Families who have incomes under \$10,000 annually can claim a tax credit for 30 percent of allowable expenses, up to a maximum credit of \$1,050. Families with adjusted gross incomes in excess of \$50,000 will be ineligible for the credit, as will the elderly whose income exceeds \$15,000.

Perhaps the most important part of this legislation is the attention paid to the special problems of those afflicted with Alzheimer's disease. Although this credit can only be used for those elderly 75 years or older, it is allowed for elderly family members who are younger if they are diagnosed to have senile dementia of the Alzheimer's type. Because Alzheimer's disease is a long-term care disorder, medicare reimburses little for the care of an Alzheimer's patient. Most of the care of an Alzheimer's patient is administered by the family, which shoulders a tremendous financial, as well as emotional, burden. This tax credit will be a much welcomed relief for these families. It is this disease and many like it that makes the Family Care Act so important to the fastest growing segment of our population, the elderly. I urge its speedy adoption.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(During the call of the roll Mr. STEVENS occupied the chair.)

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mrs. KASSERBAUM]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider all nominations under new reports, those being Calendar Nos. 74, 75, and 76, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. There is no objection to those nominations. They have been cleared on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Lincoln D. Faure, xxx-xx-xxxx
U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named commodores of the line of the Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of rear admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualifications therefore as provided by law:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be rear admiral

Dennis Matthew Brooks.
Dudley Louis Carlson.
Jack Neal Darby.
John Stephen Disher.
James Francis Dorsey, Jr.
Leon Albert Edney.
Ronald Marvin Eytchison.
William Miley Fogarty.
Diego Edyl Hernandez.
David Elmer Jeremiah.
Stewart Andrew Ring.
Robert Harper Shumaker.
Richard Coghlan Ustick.
Daniel Joseph Wolkensdorfer.

RESTRICTED LINE—ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

To be rear admiral

David Patrick Donohue.
Myron Vernon Ricketts.

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

To be rear admiral

William John Finneran.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Daniel H. Carter, of Texas, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 1989.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN THE AIR FORCE, NAVY

Air Force nominations beginning John T. Abbott, Jr., and ending Steven J. Zollman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Philip Richard Albert, and ending Andrew Anthony Kannegieser, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 20, 1985.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified that the Senate has given its consent to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATION DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 186, Education Day, U.S.A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 186) designating April 2, 1985, as "Education Day, U.S.A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 186) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

RECORD OPEN UNTIL 4 P.M.
TODAY

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD remain open until the hour of 4 p.m. today for the introduction of bills, resolutions, and the submission of statements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS

Mr. DOLE. I further ask unanimous consent that following the two leaders under the standing order, there be a special order for not to exceed 15 minutes for the following Senator: the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, following the special order just identified, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to

extend beyond the hour of 3 p.m., with statements limited therein to not more than 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I indicate that following the conclusion of morning business, it will be the intention of the majority leader to turn to the conference report to accompany H.R. 1239, African relief appropriations, and I said my intention—if we can work out some time agreement to provide no amendments be in order to amendments in disagreement, there is a possibility of rollcall votes to occur on that measure. And we still have pending the war insurance, the export control extension, and I doubt that we will have the Federal supplemental measure from the House tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the distinguished majority leader pardon my interruption? Did the Chair respond to the unanimous-consent request by the distinguished majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I believe that I did.

Mr. BYRD. All three paragraphs?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. The final one was the statement only of the intention of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. That is right.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, may I say at this point for the benefit of other Senators, particularly those on my side of the aisle, with reference to the conference report on the African relief appropriations measure that the distinguished majority leader can go to that matter, and that it is not a debatable motion in the event the majority leader has to resort to a motion.

I thank the distinguished majority leader. I thank the Chair.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 2 P.M.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 2 p.m., Tuesday, April 2, 1985.

The motion was agreed to; and at 3:12 p.m., the Senate recessed until Tuesday, April 2, 1985, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate March 29, 1985, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1985:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Beryl Wayne Sprinkel, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisors, vice Martin S. Feldstein, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 531, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform duties indicated with grade and date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force provided that in no case shall the following officers be appointed in a grade higher than that indicated.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Donald D. Fate, xxx-xx-xxxx
James S. Knight, xxx-xx-xxxx
William T. Teuton, xxx-xx-xxxx
James J. Vogel, xxx-xx-xxxx

To be major

Travis P. Barham, xxx-xx-xxxx
Carl D. Foster, xxx-xx-xxxx
Brock C. Miller, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bruce T. Sallen, xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas L. Sutton, xxx-xx-xxxx

To be captain

Deborah L. Brock, xxx-xx-xxxx
Michael R. Brown, xxx-xx-xxxx
Charles F. Defreest, xxx-xx-xxxx
Guy A. Delgadillo, xxx-xx-xxxx
Melvin L. Ford, xxx-xx-xxxx
Martha L. Garito, xxx-xx-xxxx
Robert J. Gillen, xxx-xx-xxxx
Andrew R. Klous, xxx-xx-xxxx
Nicholas J. Miniotis, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bert H. Orck, xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillip L. Parham, xxx-xx-xxxx
Gerald M. Schneider, xxx-xx-xxxx
Emil W. Tetzner, xxx-xx-xxxx
Terence C. Toft, xxx-xx-xxxx
Steven J. Whitney, xxx-xx-xxxx
Ronald G. Van Tramp, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Rudolf G. Cantu, xxx-xx-xxxx
George T. Fabian, xxx-xx-xxxx

To be major

Jack H. Baghdassarian, xxx-xx-xxxx
Timothy C. Moore, xxx-xx-xxxx

To be captain

Donald S. Geeze, xxx-xx-xxxx
Charles E. Lowrey, xxx-xx-xxxx

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 531, title 10, United States Code, with grade and date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, provided that in no case shall any of the following officers be appointed in a grade higher than that indicated.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Richard J. Moline, xxx-xx-xxxx

To be major

Duane C. Andersen, xxx-xx-xxxx
Walter K. Bruner, xxx-xx-xxxx
George B. Clark, xxx-xx-xxxx
Earl E. Turner, xxx-xx-xxxx

The following persons for appointment as Reserve of the Air Force, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 593, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Victor H. Rippe, xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Timothy G. Herbert, xxx-x-xxxx
 Christopher V. Horn, xxx-x-xxxx
 Dennis P. Mong, xxx-x-xxxx
 Anders T. Netland, xxx-x-xxxx
 Narayan V. Nimbkar, xxx-x-xxxx
 Otis E. Payne, xxx-x-xxxx
 John K. Reiman, xxx-x-xxxx

The following individual for appointment as reserve of the Air Force (ANGUS), in the grade indicated under the provisions of sections 593 and 8351, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform duties as indicated.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

John S. Ford, xxx-x-xxxx

The following individuals for appointment as reserve of the Air Force (ANGUS), in the grade indicated under the provisions of sections 593, 8351 and 8392, title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Elmer H. Green, xxx-x-xxxx

To be colonel

Harry Lee, xxx-x-xxxx

The following Air Force officer for permanent promotion in the U.S. Air Force, in accordance with the provisions of section 624, title 10, United States Code, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

Forrest C. Yancey, Jr., xxx-x-xxxx

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following students of the uniformed Services university of the Health Sciences class of 1985, for appointment in the regular Air Force, effective upon their graduation under the provisions of section 2114, title 10, United States Code, with grade and date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

Raymond L. Brewer, xxx-x-xxxx
 Matthew A. Coatsworth, xxx-x-xxxx
 Timothy J. Drehmer, xxx-x-xxxx
 Daniel M. Duffy, xxx-x-xxxx
 Diego M. Freitas, xxx-x-xxxx
 Bryan J. Funke, xxx-x-xxxx
 Thomas F. George, xxx-x-xxxx
 Ben A. Gomez, xxx-x-xxxx
 Bradley R. Gudath, xxx-x-xxxx
 Stephen R. Holt, xxx-x-xxxx
 Eugene Huang, xxx-x-xxxx
 William L. Ives, xxx-x-xxxx
 Lisa M. Judge, xxx-x-xxxx
 Howard L. Katz, xxx-x-xxxx
 Christopher J. Knapp, xxx-x-xxxx
 Kathy A. Lacivita, xxx-x-xxxx
 Timothy J. Ladner, xxx-x-xxxx
 Aimee L. Lauer, xxx-x-xxxx
 Shirley R. Lockie, xxx-x-xxxx
 Gael J. Lonergan, xxx-x-xxxx
 Andrew C. Marchiando, xxx-x-xxxx
 Donald M. Meduna, xxx-x-xxxx
 Sean L. Murphy, xxx-x-xxxx
 Jeffrey A. Niezgoda, xxx-x-xxxx
 Jonathan P. O'Neal, xxx-x-xxxx
 Robert A. Panico, xxx-x-xxxx
 Michael W. Peterson, xxx-x-xxxx
 Arnyce R. Pock, xxx-x-xxxx
 Steven M. Princiotta, xxx-x-xxxx
 Robert M. Saad, xxx-x-xxxx
 Eric J. Simko, xxx-x-xxxx
 Randall W. Smart, xxx-x-xxxx
 Howard L. Suls, xxx-x-xxxx
 Horace Tsu, xxx-x-xxxx

David P. Vanderburgh, xxx-x-xxxx

Robert P. Vogt, xxx-x-xxxx

Gregory M. Wickern, xxx-x-xxxx

Paul E. Wright, xxx-x-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Army in accordance with the appropriate provisions of title 10, United States Code, Sections 624 and 628:

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

Ricardo Alba, xxx-x-xxxx
 Charles H. Anderson, xxx-x-xxxx
 Jerald D. Clark, xxx-x-xxxx
 Frank H. Gilliam, Jr., xxx-x-xxxx
 Matthew P. Gustat III, xxx-x-xxxx
 Walter R. Hays, Sr., xxx-x-xxxx
 Darlow L. Inberg, xxx-x-xxxx
 Malachi B. Jones, xxx-x-xxxx
 Thomas W. Murphy, xxx-x-xxxx
 Jacob H. Perkins, xxx-x-xxxx
 Rex S. Roper, xxx-x-xxxx
 Charles E. Thomas, xxx-x-xxxx
 Karl A. Tibbetts, xxx-x-xxxx
 Lawrence R. Woods, xxx-x-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Carlos B.G. Campbell, xxx-x-xxxx
 Wolfgang K. Werner, xxx-x-xxxx

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

William S. Johnson, xxx-x-xxxx

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Cynthia L. Murray, xxx-x-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

Robert T. Anderson, xxx-x-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

The following named Reserve Officers' Training Corps, cadets for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 531, 532, 533:

Abbenhaus, Harald K., xxx-x-xxxx
 Abbott, David L., xxx-x-xxxx
 Abdill, Peter H., xxx-x-xxxx
 Acklin, Steven W., xxx-x-xxxx
 Adams, Michael J., xxx-x-xxxx
 Adams, Reed M., xxx-x-xxxx
 Adams, Robert L., xxx-x-xxxx
 Adkins, Mark A., xxx-x-xxxx
 Agathos, Spiros N., xxx-x-xxxx
 Agrafiotis, Lisa A., xxx-x-xxxx
 Ahsam, Joseph J., xxx-x-xxxx
 Alkman, Cynthia, xxx-x-xxxx
 Akam, Robert B., xxx-x-xxxx
 Alexander, Jeffery R., xxx-x-xxxx
 Alexander, Pamela, xxx-x-xxxx
 Allice, Israel, xxx-x-xxxx
 Allen, Michael J., xxx-x-xxxx
 Allen, Reginald E., xxx-x-xxxx
 Allen, Samuel W., xxx-x-xxxx
 Allert, Mark A., xxx-x-xxxx
 Allison, Dana A., xxx-x-xxxx
 Alston, Randal C., xxx-x-xxxx
 Altheide, Robert W., xxx-x-xxxx
 Amann, Franz J., xxx-x-xxxx
 Amitrano, Robert, xxx-x-xxxx
 Ammerman, Franklin W., xxx-x-xxxx
 Amos, Robert P., Jr., xxx-x-xxxx
 Anderson, Cynthia L., xxx-x-xxxx
 Anderson, Holly B., xxx-x-xxxx
 Anderson, Ralph H., xxx-x-xxxx
 Anderson, Randall G., xxx-x-xxxx
 Anderson, Rexford G., xxx-x-xxxx
 Anderson, Richard J., xxx-x-xxxx

Anderson, Robert W., xxx-x-xxxx

Ando, Tobin, K., xxx-x-xxxx

Andrews, Chris L., xxx-x-xxxx

Anninos, Dionysios, xxx-x-xxxx

Annis, David P., xxx-x-xxxx

Anthony, Arturo, xxx-x-xxxx

Aragon, Antonio, xxx-x-xxxx

Archuleta, Denise A., xxx-x-xxxx

Are, David C., xxx-x-xxxx

Armbruster, Lance A., xxx-x-xxxx

Armstead, Michael A., xxx-x-xxxx

Armstrong, Timothy C., xxx-x-xxxx

Arnold, John K., IV, xxx-x-xxxx

Arroyo, Jose L., xxx-x-xxxx

Ashbaugh, John C., xxx-x-xxxx

Ashburn, Margaret E., xxx-x-xxxx

Asher, David W., xxx-x-xxxx

Ashley, Donald D., xxx-x-xxxx

Atwood, Susan, xxx-x-xxxx

Auen, Gary L., xxx-x-xxxx

Aunan, Robert B., xxx-x-xxxx

Austin, Jeffrey P., xxx-x-xxxx

Auvil, Timothy P., xxx-x-xxxx

Avant, Don R., xxx-x-xxxx

Averyt, Lauren C., xxx-x-xxxx

Ayala, Miguel A., xxx-x-xxxx

Babb, Jeffery G., Jr., xxx-x-xxxx

Babich, Robert J., II, xxx-x-xxxx

Babine, Stephen M., xxx-x-xxxx

Bacay, Alex A., xxx-x-xxxx

Baer, Robert A., xxx-x-xxxx

Baez, Juan A., xxx-x-xxxx

Bagley, Marine R., xxx-x-xxxx

Bailey, Anthony J., xxx-x-xxxx

Bailey, Jeffrey D., xxx-x-xxxx

Bailey, Tony, xxx-x-xxxx

Bain, Stan D., xxx-x-xxxx

Baker, Gregory P., xxx-x-xxxx

Baker, Sandra L., xxx-x-xxxx

Bakum, Borys, xxx-x-xxxx

Ball, James F., xxx-x-xxxx

Barber, Michael D., xxx-x-xxxx

Barinoswki, Robert E., III, xxx-x-xxxx

Barker, Michael R., xxx-x-xxxx

Barkley, Ronald B., xxx-x-xxxx

Barnes, Leslie D., xxx-x-xxxx

Barnes, Melody M., xxx-x-xxxx

Barnes, Paul N., xxx-x-xxxx

Barnes, Warren R., Jr., xxx-x-xxxx

Barnett, Thomas J., xxx-x-xxxx

Barnhill, Rex A., xxx-x-xxxx

Barone, Alexander, xxx-x-xxxx

Barr, Barry A., xxx-x-xxxx

Barrett, Randy R., xxx-x-xxxx

Bass, Margaret A., xxx-x-xxxx

Bastian, Jerold D., xxx-x-xxxx

Bauer, Robert M., II, xxx-x-xxxx

Baumann, John A., xxx-x-xxxx

Baumann, Michael A., xxx-x-xxxx

Baxter, William T., xxx-x-xxxx

Bayer, Hayden W., xxx-x-xxxx

Beaudoin, Jill A., xxx-x-xxxx

Beaulieu, Henry H., xxx-x-xxxx

Beck, Lawrence J., xxx-x-xxxx

Beckman, Ann M., xxx-x-xxxx

Beckwith, Mary R., xxx-x-xxxx

Bedell, Christopher J., xxx-x-xxxx

Beekman, Roger L., xxx-x-xxxx

Beers, Randall J., xxx-x-xxxx

Beery, Gina L., xxx-x-xxxx

Belcher, James B., xxx-x-xxxx

Bell, Lori L., xxx-x-xxxx

Bella, Timothy A., xxx-x-xxxx

Belt, Paul E., xxx-x-xxxx

Bender, Christopher S., xxx-x-xxxx

Benedict, Leith A., xxx-x-xxxx

Benedict, Mark J., xxx-x-xxxx

Benjamin, Randall S., xxx-x-xxxx

Bennis, John G., xxx-x-xxxx

Benson, Mark A., xxx-x-xxxx

Bentley, Ernest L., III, xxx-x-xxxx

Benton, Gus II, xxx-x-xxxx

Berg, Stephen J., xxx-x-xxxx

Bernstein, Timothy B., xxx-x-xxxx

Beron, Thomas E., xxx-x-
 Berrier, Grey D., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bessler, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Betz, Cynthia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beyer, Kay C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bibb, Robert B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bibbs, Hastie D., xxx-x-
 Biel, Lee E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bier, Gregory L., xxx-x-
 Bird, Allen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bird, Carl D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bird, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bird, Steven T., xxx-xx-x-
 Bitterman, David A., xxx-x-
 Bivona, Ralph F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bjerk, Bradley M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Black, Ricky G., xxx-x-
 Black, Wayne L., xxx-x-
 Blackwell, Dana K., xxx-xx-x-
 Blackwell, Jennifer A., xxx-xx-xx-
 Blair, Mark A., xxx-x-
 Blaise, Judith C., xxx-x-
 Blake, Michael E., xxx-x-
 Blevins, Beverly R., xxx-xx-x-
 Blevins, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blocker, Marion D., xxx-xx-x-
 Blockhus, Christopher L., xxx-x-
 Bly, John S., xxx-x-
 Boaz, Mark B., xxx-x-
 Bobo, Christopher S., xxx-xx-xx-
 Bogusz, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-
 Bolze, Lorelei F., xxx-x-
 Booth, Edwin R., xxx-x-
 Boozell, James H., III, xxx-xx-x-
 Bouch, Young A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boulton, Letha C., xxx-xx-xx-
 Bowden, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowens, Lori E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowling, Timothy S., xxx-xx-xx-
 Bowman, Patrick S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowman, Quint A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyd, Kimberly D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradley, Charles A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradshaw, Carl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradtmueller, Kurt A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bragdon, Brain N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brandon, James H., xxx-xx-x-
 Brandsma, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brannan, Derick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Branscom, David D., xxx-xx-x-
 Bray, Laura A., xxx-xx-x-
 Brendler, Joseph A., xxx-xx-x-
 Bressie, Robin M., xxx-xx-x-
 Brewer, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Briggs, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brindley, Brian P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brischke, Karla J., xxx-x-
 Broadus, Matthew W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bromon, Isaiah W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bronner, Scott W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brostrand, Carl H., IV, xxx-x-
 Brown, Barton L., xxx-x-
 Brown, Brenda L., xxx-x-
 Brown, Harry S., xxx-x-
 Brown, Joane K., xxx-x-
 Brown, Veronica D., xxx-x-
 Browning, Judy A., xxx-x-
 Bruno, Cynthia, xxx-x-
 Bruno, Mark T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryant, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryant, Sherman E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryant, Weylan A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bryn, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buck, Christopher S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buckley, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buennemeyer, Timothy K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bumbarger, Johnna L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bundy, Wayne J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Buonerba, Jon K., xxx-xx-x-
 Burg, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burkhardt, Shane R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burmeister, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burnette, Anthony W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burnia, Marc A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burns, Robert C., xxx-xx-xx-
 Burns, Robert H., Jr., xxx-x-
 Burns, Stephen T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burrell, David W., xxx-x-
 Busch, Gregory J., xxx-x-
 Butler, Brian O., xxx-x-
 Butler, Ret D., xxx-x-
 Byrd, Charles T., xxx-x-
 Caccamo, Samuel M., xxx-x-
 Cade, Kenneth B., xxx-x-
 Cadwallader, Gretchen A., xxx-x-
 Cady, Kenneth R., xxx-x-
 Caffee, Ronald D., xxx-x-
 Cahalane, Daniel J., xxx-x-
 Cain, Gordon R., xxx-x-
 Cairns, Andrew H., xxx-x-
 Calder, Michael L., xxx-x-
 Calhoun, David A., xxx-x-
 Callan, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Calvo, Lynn D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campbell, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cantrall, Miles, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cantwell, Thomas V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caporicci, Rita, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caraballo, Rafael, xxx-x-
 Card, Dennis A., xxx-x-
 Caringer, David A., xxx-x-
 Carlson, Mark K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlson, Randall W., xxx-x-
 Carlson, Scott M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carlucci, Carty G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carmody, Martin T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carnazza, Vincent C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carpenter, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carr, Jeffrey M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carraway, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carrigan, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caruso, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cary, Matthew G., xxx-xx-xx-
 Cashion, Jerry, xxx-xx-
 Caskey, Perry N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cason, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cassella, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cassidy, Paul C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cassot, Robert W., xxx-xx-xx-
 Castello, Gregory R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Castle, Christopher M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Castlemann, Byron T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Castro, Luis, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Caudle, Justin W., xxx-xx-xx-
 Causey, Mary R., xxx-x-
 Cavanaugh, Dianne M., xxx-x-
 Cavoli, Ivo J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chaffee, Dewey T., xxx-x-
 Chalovich, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chamberlain, Eugene J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chamberlain, Kim E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chamberlain, Paul W., xxx-xx-xx-
 Chandler, Tonney A., xxx-xx-xx-
 Chando Andrew J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chappelle, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Charles, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Charles, Nicholas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chase, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chastain, Jerry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chatburn, Timothy, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chavis, Nikita, xxx-x-
 Chavis, Tracy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chenail, Steven S., xxx-x-
 Chenoweth, John M., xxx-x-
 Cherrier, Linda R., xxx-x-
 Chester, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Chiarella, Louis A., xxx-x-
 Childers, Scott A., xxx-x-
 Chosewood, Caren S., xxx-x-
 Christenson, Craig J., xxx-x-
 Christian, Michael J., xxx-x-
 Chung, Michael A., xxx-x-
 Chuzie, Deborah L., xxx-x-
 Cleply, Kevin M., xxx-xx-xx-
 Cincotta, Mark J., xxx-x-
 Cino, Joseph V., xxx-x-
 Clark, Michael R., xxx-x-
 Clark, Patricia A., xxx-x-
 Clarke, Frederick S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clarke, Jacqueline M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clayborn, Benjamin B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clement, Mark F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clemons, Daniel C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cleveland, Eric M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cliver, Barry K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clough, Leith B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cloutier, Michelle A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cluxton, Vincent T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coates, Joseph C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coble, Elizabeth A., xxx-x-
 Cochran, Andrew V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cockrell, Mark K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cohagen, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cole, Jimmy C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coleman, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coleman, Theresa E., xxx-x-
 Collier, Peter C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Colvin, Darryl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cone, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conklin, Judith A., xxx-x-
 Conley, Gregg G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Connell, Lawrence B., xxx-x-
 Connor, Patricia M., xxx-x-
 Connors, John C., xxx-x-
 Cook, Michael R., xxx-x-
 Copeland, George R., xxx-x-
 Corbin, Demetrious L., xxx-xx-
 Corbin, Warren L., xxx-x-
 Corkery, Christopher, xxx-x-
 Cornelson, Brian C., xxx-x-
 Cornelissen, Curtis E., xxx-x-
 Corser, William M., xxx-x-
 Cosby, Annette D., xxx-x-
 Cosby, Leonard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Costella, Robert T., xxx-x-
 Costello, Jennifer A., xxx-x-
 Costich, Lawrence A., xxx-x-
 Cottle, Stephen M., xxx-x-
 Couch, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coughenour, Candice D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cox, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coyle, Linda K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craig, Marylou, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Craig, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cranmer, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crawford, Bruce T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crean, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crespo, Luis B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Creviston, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crill, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crisler, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crockett, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Croutharmel, Richard, xxx-x-
 Crow, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crowe, Margaret S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cruz, Anthony, xxx-xx-
 Cuellar, Guadalupe, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cuff, Shawn M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cullings, Gregg W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cullison, Lana L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Culp, Kathleen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Culwell, Joe E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cummings, Anthony W., xxx-xx-
 Cummings, Brian K., xxx-x-
 Cunningham, John R., xxx-x-
 Curtsinger, Kent C., xxx-xx-
 Daddario, Daniel, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dahl, Joan S., xxx-x-
 Dalley, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dallao, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dallan, Antoinette, xxx-x-
 Dana, Matthew L., xxx-x-
 Daniels, Bret A., xxx-x-
 Danna, James W., III, xxx-x-
 Darden, Mark C., xxx-x-
 Dash, Christopher E., xxx-x-
 Dashiell, Andrew F., xxx-x-
 Daum, Richard S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Brian U., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Charles A., xxx-x-
 Davis, David B., xxx-x-
 Davis, Forrest L., xxx-x-

Davis, Elizabeth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Paul T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Scott K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Scott S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dawson, Matthew Q., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Deasy, Richard M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 DeBarto, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Debolt, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Delarosa, Santos A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dellane, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demko, Thomas F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demps, Kelvin B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Denham, Albert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dennis, Jeffrey B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Depeppe, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Derdzinski, Therese J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Desantiago, Angel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Detoy, Brian M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dewey, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dickinson, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dill, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dillard, Andrea E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diller, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dilorenzo, Julia, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dingas, Gregory E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dixon, Lillian A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dobbs, Ray B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dobitsch, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dodman, Lynette M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dodson, Todd L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doebel, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donaldson, Kurt A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Donlea, Shelly L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Doorn, Bradley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dorf, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Douglass, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Drake, Steven G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Drees, Laurel S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Driano, Dominick V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dries, Mark G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Driscoll, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duer, Deborah L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duer, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duff, Murray J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duffey, Brain D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dugan, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duggan, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duggleby, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunaway, Joe D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dunlap, Johnny J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dupont, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dutke, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dutterer, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dvorak, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dydasco, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eaddy, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eberlein, Mark G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edge, Catherine L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Edge, Liston L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ehmann, Brady S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ehrenberger, Theresa A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elisenberger, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elder, Amy C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elder, Donna L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elenchin, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Elias, Lisa L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ellis, Andrea R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ellis, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Emmons, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Empric, Leigh A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Engdahl, Julie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Engel, Craig A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Engelhardt, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ensey, Alana A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Entwistle, Andrew G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Enz, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erickson, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erickson, Nils J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eristoff, D.G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Erlandson, Ernest A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eror, Alec T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Escobano, Raul, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Esten, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Estes, Samuel Z., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Eubanks, Charles D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Evans, Gregory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Evans, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ekley, Clinton R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Exum, Larnell B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Faddis, Matthew J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fahn, Greg A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fahy, Timothy P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fail, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fairley, Timothy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fannin, Laura B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farley, Chris A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farmer, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Farquhar, Scott C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Feagin, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fears, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fecteau, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Feigler, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fellows, Scott M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferris, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ferris, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fervier, John T., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fetzner, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fey, Kathryn C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Figueroa, Enrique, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finch, Gertrude E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finger, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finn, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Finneran, Christopher F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fitzenreiter, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fitzgerald, Scott M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flanagan, Francis T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flashe, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fleischman, Lisa M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Floate, Timothy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flohr, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Floyd, Brad A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flynn, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flynn, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Flynn, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Forance, Anne R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ford, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ford, Mark V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Forte, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fortich, Rise P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foster, Brian D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foster, Gregory K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Foster, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fountain, Augustus W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fox, Clarizza M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fredrickson, Eric L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freeland, Harvill A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freeland, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freels, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freeman, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freeman, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freeman, Harveta A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freeman, Teresa A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Freitag, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frenette, Andree V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Primel, Edward M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fromm, Kris A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pucci, Guy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fuhrman, Cynthia L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Funt, Susan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Purey, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gainer, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaire, Susan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Galgano, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gallagher, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gallaway, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gamble, Duane A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garcia, Katherine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Paul B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gardner, Royal C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garner, Ches H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garrant, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garrett, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garza, Katy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaskin, Katherine L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaskins, Galloway, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaston, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gatbonton, Salvador D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Gates, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gatlin, Rufus S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gaus, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guvula, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gawkins, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Geddis, Sheral D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gellert, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx
 George, Wallace S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gereski, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Germano, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gerometta, Gregg L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gettle, Mitchell L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gibson, Jimmy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gies, Timothy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glessing, William B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gifford, Nancy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilbert, Alice M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gill, Joseph I., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillen, Maureen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gillis, Duncan A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilroy, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gingras, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ginsburg, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gitlin, Beth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Giza, Kathryn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glabus, Edmund M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glad, Daniel C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glanton, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glasser, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Glover, Brian P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goddette, Michele L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goetz, Jill D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goff, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gold, Jonathan C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goldmeier, Janice M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Golightly, Glen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gomes, Clarence J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goodwin, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goolsby, Carl, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gordon, Larry, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gorton, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goss, Warren J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Goudzwaard, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gourlie, Bruce J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gouveia, Randall C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gowens, Daphne J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grady, Glen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graham, Glenn T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graham, Kathleen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Graham, Ray A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gramig, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Granfield, Kerry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Granier, Vernon J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grant, Philip G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grant, Russell A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gray, Aaron D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gray, Kathryn M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grazer, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grebe, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Amos A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Brian A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Green, Norman B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greene, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Greenlee, Wade S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griffin, Catherine F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griffin, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griffith, Maureen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griffith, Kevin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grogan, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gross, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grow, Randal J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grzech, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guarino, Nickolas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gullyard, Joseph S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gum, Cary M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gunderson, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guthrie, Betsy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Guy, Brian J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haas, Christopher K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hackett, Guy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hagan, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haight, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Haines, Michelle L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hajak, Jerald D.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hoskins, Dewey D.	xxx-x	Keyes, Jeffrey S.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Frank R.	xxx-x	Hoskins, Walter G.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Khan, Talibah T.	xxx-x
Hall, James D.	xxx-x	Hoskinson, Ronald A.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kiernan, Sandra P.	xxx-x
Hall, Steven, S.	xxx-x	Howard, David E., III	xxx-x	Kieta, Bruce E.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamer, Frederick R.	xxx-x	Howard, Gregory J.	xxx-x	Kievenaar, Henry A., III	xxx-x
Hamilton, Matthew B.	xxx-x	Howell, Jerald R.	xxx-x	Kilgore, Victor K.	xxx-x
Hamilton, Ricky J.	xxx-x	Howerton, Henry K.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kimler, Kirk M.	xxx-x
Hamilton, Sharon R.	xxx-x	Hoyle, Philip A.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kinman, Christopher Y.	xxx-x
Hammerle, Lisa L.	xxx-x	Huber, Francis J.	xxx-x	Kirby, James E.	xxx-x
Hammond, Richard A.	xxx-x	Hudson, Anthony H.	xxx-x	Kirn, John A.	xxx-x
Hancock, Kimberly K.	xxx-x	Hudson, Danny.	xxx-x	Kiser, Meg F.	xxx-x
Hand, Edward A.	xxx-x	Hudson, Jerome.	xxx-x	Klein, Gary W.	xxx-x
Hansen, Victor M.	xxx-x	Huffman, Lisa A.	xxx-x	Klimczak, Robert L.	xxx-x
Hansley, Earnest E.	xxx-x	Hugee, Bernard.	xxx-x	Kmieciak, Robert J.	xxx-x
Harden, Nathaniel.	xxx-x	Hughes, Edgar A., Jr.	xxx-x	Knapp, Warren D.	xxx-x
Harfst, Richard A.	xxx-x	Huisenga, Kevin M.	xxx-x	Knock, Robert D.	xxx-x
Hargis, Gary M.	xxx-x	Hunt, Nathan D.	xxx-x	Knowles, Richard E.	xxx-x
Harmon, Bobbie J.	xxx-x	Hunter, Richard D.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kohl, Richard W.	xxx-x
Harmon, Darrell W.	xxx-x	Huppmann, John P.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kohler, Terri S.	xxx-x
Harper, Frederick D.	xxx-x	Hurley, Ann A.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kohrman, Shawn T.	xxx-x
Harper, John, III	xxx-x	Hurley, Paul C., Jr.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kontos, Daniel T.	xxx-x
Harr, Douglas S.	xxx-x	Hutchison, Richard K.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kools, Joseph M.	xxx-x
Harrington, Michael E.	xxx-x	Hyatt, John R.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kopacki, Christine.	xxx-x
Harris, Brent A.	xxx-x	Hyde, Kevin A.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Koreen, Mildred K.	xxx-x
Harris, John A.	xxx-x	Iacono, Lauren C.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kostelnik, Lori J.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrison, Patrick R.	xxx-x	Ikirt, Steven C.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kotwal, Russ S.	xxx-x
Harter, Wendy L.	xxx-x	Imhof, Kirk A.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kotz, Victoria A.	xxx-x
Haselden, Bruce E.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Indelicato, Thomas C.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kovell Judy.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Haste, Robert G.	xxx-x	Irby, Marshall G.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kowal, Andrew J.	xxx-x
Hatcher, Clay B.	xxx-x	Ivey, Richard R.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kraak, Gary M.	xxx-x
Haycraft, Kenneth K.	xxx-x	Iwicki, Stephen K.	xxx-x	Kresky, John P., Jr.	xxx-x
Hayes, Billy, Jr.	xxx-x	Jachim, Robert J., Jr.	xxx-xx	Krivda, Stephen J.	xxx-x
Hayes, Sara A.	xxx-x	Jacks, Holger.	xxx-x	Kroeger, William R.	xxx-x
Hayman, Jeffery W.	xxx-xx	Jackson, George P., Jr.	xxx-xx	Kruse, John D.	xxx-x
Haynes, Keith L.	xxx-x	Jackson, Victor, H.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Kurz, Henry M.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Haynes, Scott B.	xxx-x	Jacky, Joseph D.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Labadie, Robert L.	xxx-x
Healy, Patrick J.	xxx-xx-x	Jacobs, James M.	xxx-x	Lachance, Matthew S.	xxx-x
Hefty, Robert J.	xxx-x	Jacobson, Scott A.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lafrance, Kevin G.	xxx-x
Heilman, Mark R.	xxx-x	Jahnke, Jeffery A.	xxx-x	Lake, Timothy L.	xxx-x
Heisler, Terrence J.	xxx-x	Janning, Michael R.	xxx-x	Lambert, David A.	xxx-x
Helbling, Anthony A.	xxx-x	Jedlicka, John J.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lambert, Peggy C.	xxx-x
Helgeson, Diane L.	xxx-x	Jeffers, William.	xxx-x	Lamkin, Stephen A.	xxx-x
Heller, Bruce A.	xxx-x	Jenkins, Rachel J.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lammers, Nanci J.	xxx-x
Helman, Eric T.	xxx-x	Jenks, David S.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lamport, Frank E.	xxx-x
Henderson, James H.	xxx-x	Jensen, Harry M., III	xxx-xx	Landry, Michelle M.	xxx-x
Henderson, James L.	xxx-x	Jesse, Michael J.	xxx-x	Landy, Francis P.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Henderson, Mary L.	xxx-x	Jeter, James E.	xxx-x	Lape, David W.	xxx-x
Hendricks, Philip D.	xxx-x	Jobson, Francisco J.	xxx-xx	Lapoint, Reagan P.	xxx-x
Hendrickson, Daniel.	xxx-x	Jocz, Norbert B.	xxx-x	Larsen, Diana L.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Hennen, William L.	xxx-x	Jodon, Christopher D.	xxx-x	Lashley, Cheryl J.	xxx-x
Henry, Douglas F.	xxx-x	Joel, Alexander W.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lauser, Loretta E.	xxx-xx
Henshaw, Todd W.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Johnson, Allen M.	xxx-x	Lavake, Mark G.	xxx-x
Herke, Larry J.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Johnson, Andrew J.	xxx-x	Lawrence, Jeffrey J.	xxx-xx
Herrera, Nicolas A.	xxx-x	Johnson, Bernard A.	xxx-x	Lawson, Edward T.	xxx-x
Hersh, Bernard S.	xxx-xx-x	Johnson, Carl M.	xxx-x	Layton, Anthony A.	xxx-x
Hersh, Steven D.	xxx-x	Johnson, Darrin J.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Leahy, Mary K.	xxx-x
Hess, Lonnie W.	xxx-x	Johnson, Kenneth L.	xxx-xx	Leboeuf, Eugene J.	xxx-xx-x
Hestand, Paul D.	xxx-x	Johnson, Kurt W.	xxx-x	Lecleir, Gregory J.	xxx-x
Hester, Henry M., Jr.	xxx-x	Johnson, Mark A.	xxx-x	Lee, Alvin B.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Hewitt, Cynthia A.	xxx-x	Johnson, Melanie A.	xxx-x	Lee, Donald A.	xxx-x
Hickey, David E.	xxx-x	Johnson, Nathaniel, Jr.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lee, Giblest R., III	xxx-x
Higgins, Christopher P.	xxx-x	Johnson, William S.	xxx-x	Lee, Glenn P.	xxx-x
Hightower, Lauren A.	xxx-x	Johnston, David.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lee, Jung N.	xxx-x
Hill, David C.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Joles, Jeffery K.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lee, Kevin C.	xxx-x
Hill, Sherry N.	xxx-x	Jones, Allen S.	xxx-x	Lee, Terry M.	xxx-xx-xx
Hirsch, Daniel R.	xxx-x	Jones, Barry R.	xxx-x	Lefebvre, Stephen E.	xxx-x
Hobar, Scott M.	xxx-x	Jones, David E.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Leighow, John K.	xxx-x
Hodell, Evelyn F.	xxx-x	Jones, Roger T.	xxx-x	Leith, Charles S.	xxx-x
Hodge, Charles D.	xxx-x	Jordan, Eric M.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lenway, Charles E.	xxx-x
Hodges, Terry D.	xxx-x	Jordan, Robert C.	xxx-x	Leonard, Richard D.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Hogan, David A.	xxx-x	Juergens, Richard A., Jr.	xxx-xx	Leone, Louis C.	xxx-x
Holland, Daniel E.	xxx-x	Kalfayan, Deborah R.	xxx-x	Lester, Kerry L.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Holland, Kevin L.	xxx-x	Kailman, Thomas J.	xxx-x	Letizia, Jay A.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Holland, Ruth E.	xxx-x	Katsiyiannis, Dean T.	xxx-xx	Letnauchyn, Bohdan W.	xxx-xx
Holliday, David E.	xxx-x	Kavanaugh, Donald W.	xxx-xx	Leto, Thomas A.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Holmes, Michael E.	xxx-x	Kell, Michael T.	xxx-x	Lewis, Wesley J.	xxx-x
Holt, Jeffrey W.	xxx-xx	Keller, David P.	xxx-xx-xxxx	Lias, Robert A.	xxx-x
Hoop, Elmer P., III	xxx-x	Kelly, Maureen A.	xxx-xx-x	Liebertson, David.	xxx-x
Hoppman, Clifford M.	xxx-x	Kelly, William F.	xxx-x	Lilac, Laura J.	xxx-xx
Horne, Kenneth R.	xxx-x	Kennitz, David A.	xxx-x	Lilek, William R.	xxx-x
Horton, John R.	xxx-xx	Kennedy, Brian M.	xxx-x	Lillie, Michael W.	xxx-x
Horton, Keith V.	xxx-x	Kenner, Sharon L.	xxx-x	Lindhardt, Gary A.	xxx-xx-xxxx
Horton, Scott T.	xxx-x	Kessler, Susan L.	xxx-x	Lindsay, Michael A.	xxx-x
Horvath, Mary C.	xxx-xx-xx	Key, Robert G., Jr.	xxx-x	Lindsey, Jeffrey C.	xxx-xx-xxxx

Lindsey, Jonathan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lineberger, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lingg, Aloysius G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lipscomb, Tracy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Littkett, Louis A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Little, Kathleen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Livingston, Craig A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lloyd, Garth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lloyd, Kelvin O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Logan, Arlen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lokensgard, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lombardo, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lombardo, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Loughney, Thomas M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Love, Darren C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lucas, Andrews J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luff, Sandra E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lukauski, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Luna, Maximo Z., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lyons, Christopher W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lyons, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mabe, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 MacDonald, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 MacKenzie, Scot D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 MacMaster, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Madigan, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mafnas, Norma A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Magdycz, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mahoney, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mains, Ellen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Malee, Thomas M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mallis, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mallory, Gregory V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mallory, Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Malone, Marvin S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manchego, Joey N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mann, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mann, Marc F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Manning, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mansberger, Samuel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mantz, Albert P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 March, Steven P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marcos, Elmer D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marion, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marquardt, Clinton J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marquez, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marrero, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marsh, William S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Marshall, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martel, Valerie B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Ted F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Val J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martindale, Antonio W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martino, Diane L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maselli, Arthur V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maser, Ralph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mason, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mason, Jon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mason, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mateyka, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mathes, Brett D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matthews, Glenn P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matuszak, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Maurer, Ronald J. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mayer, Todd A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mayfield, Randall D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mazerik, Andrew R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McAlpine, Margaret S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McAndrews, Laura J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McAuliffe, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McBride, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCarth, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCarty, Michael M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCarty, Tony J. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCastlain, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McChesney, Philip R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClaney, Alfonso, V. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClelland, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCluskey, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCollam, Rebecca L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCombs, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McConnell, April E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCormick, Horace, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

McCraw, Charles K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McCuan, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDade, Edward W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDaniel, Cathryn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDaniel, Corean C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDaniel, Corvelli, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDaries, Edwin F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDermott, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McDermott, Sean M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McGee, Jeffrey K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McIlwain, Lori E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McIntire, Robert L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKeithern, Timothy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKenzie, Leann M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKinnon, Robert I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKittrick, Lynne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McLaughlin, Robert F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMahan, Esteban N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMillan, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMillon, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMullen, Jon J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McMullen, Malcolm H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNally, Matthew G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNeal, Neal C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNeil, Robert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McNulty, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McSherry, Arie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McSwain, Dwayne N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Means, Kandace D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Medcalf, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meek, David D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mees, Calvin K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meister, Jeffrey R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mercer, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mercer, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mercier, Joan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mercier, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merkel, Kenneth O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Merritt, Layne B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Messenger, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meszaros, Lisa R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Metelko, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Meyer, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Michels, Rosemary, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Micks, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mihaan, Valar J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milles Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Angela M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Barbara L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Carl F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Eric H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Frank A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Grady, J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Kurt F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miller, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Millsbaugh, Kevin C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Miner, Guy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mines, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mitsch, Carrie F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Molongowski, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Monk, Charlie C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montgomery, Gerald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montgomery, Karen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Montoya, Francisco, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moon, Russell S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Ralph P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mora, Teddy, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moreland, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moreno, Guillermo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morrell, Anthony M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morrin, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morton, Cheryl L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morton, Dwayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morton, Lucious B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mosman, Donald E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mott, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moxley, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mullis, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Murphy, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Lisa T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murray, Jay P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murray, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murray, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Myers, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nagley, Scott G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nalepa, Nicholas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nantz, Eric W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Narduzzi, Carlo J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nazario, Antonia E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nazario, Edgar D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neal, Kevin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nealon, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neely, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neff, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Ernest L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Andrew B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Bennard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neputer, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nethery, Phillip T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nettleship, Charles F., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nevew, Barry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Neville, Martin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newcomer, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newman, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newsome, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Newton, Nelson E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nichols, Wayne T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nieder, Beatrice L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nieto, Yolanda, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nixon, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Noel, Cary T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nolan, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Noonan, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norton, Audrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nosal, Roxanne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Novak, Timothy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nugent, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Obradovich Todd, xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Brien, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Brien, Melton D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Connor, Vincent P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Connor, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Connor, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Connor, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Hara, Gregory M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Keffe, Kevin C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olegario, Cesar C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olivari, Rene G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oliver, Christopher M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olsen, Jeffery L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Bruce L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Neil, Scott E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Quinn, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orck, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orndorff, Derek T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oros, Abraham Q., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Orr, James C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Osborne, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Sullivan, Mary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 O'Sullivan, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ottillge, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Otto, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ouellette, Mark B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Overholser, Randy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owens, Bonnie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owens, Rosia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owens, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Owens, Wade A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paguaga, Ricardo F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pajak, Jennifer L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pang, Keung C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pappas, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Anthony W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Wynona D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parks, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parks, Timothy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parry, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Partin, Donnell W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Passey, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pate, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Patterson, Cynthia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pavlo, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Payne, Janet A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Payne Louie K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pearl, Joanne T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pederson, Ted J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pedretti, Randy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pehlman, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pehoviak, Chris G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Penha, Frank G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peoples, Carmen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perkins, Anthony M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perrier, Bradley G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perry, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Personett, Anthony W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Personett, Dale W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peters, Kelly K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peters, Maria C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peters, Ralph H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peters, Ramona O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peterson, Erik C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pettigrew, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phelps, Angela R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Phillips, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Plasecki, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Picca, Bernardo A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pierson, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Plette, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pile, Elisabeth H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pirtle, James J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Plumb, Mnsion E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Podratsky, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poe, Matthew D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poels, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pool, Daniel G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Popielarski, Brenda L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porter, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porter, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Porter, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Posner, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poust, Rebecca A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powell, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powell, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Powers, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pozniak, Edmund A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Preler, Brian J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prescott, W. B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Price, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Prusak, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pugh, Connie E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pugmire, Brian M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Purcell, Gerald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Putnam, Robin C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quarles, Vincent G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quetell, Guillermo, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quick, Wayne F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quinn, Jeffrey R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quinn, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Quint, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Race, Janis H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rackovan, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rademacher, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Raimonde, Marianne, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ramsey, Hubert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ranieri, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rapp, Karen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rarig, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Raville, Lawrence J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Raymer, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reams, Mike R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Redlinger, Laura A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Jeffery S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reed, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reedy, Reah S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reeves, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reid, Carlos P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reid, Richard J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reidy, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reiersen, Millie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reilly, Susan, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reinwald, Brian R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Resko, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reynolds, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rhodehamel, Wesley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rice, Cedric T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rice, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rice, Sean P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richards, Albert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Richardson, Winston S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riddle, Kenneth H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riddle, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riffle, Scottie K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riggs, Roger C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riley, Craig A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rine, Albert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Risaliti, Maria D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Risberg, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ritch, Joseph B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rivera, Delis, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rivera, Jose A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rivera, Miguel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rizzo, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roane, Cheryl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robbins, Neil B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Ivy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, Shirl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robertson, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Earl G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Leslie G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Mildred A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robinson, William R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roche, Gregory F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rodehorst, Eric A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rodgers, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rogers, Westleon P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roney, Carol R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roome, Ralph F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rosado, Eddie, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rose, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ross, Jonathan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ross, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ross, Ray T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rothas, Jill A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roushar, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rousseau, Joan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roussos, Christopher W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rowland, Kevin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rowlett, Wilfred G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roy, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Royka, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ruch, Martin F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rucki, Cathy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ruddle, Valerie E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rudisill, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rulapaugh, Allison R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ruoff, Jan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rush, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Russell, Janice Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Russell, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Russo, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ryan, Lori S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ryan, Matthew E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ryan, Ricky A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ryan, Sean A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sacchetti, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Salas, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Saldivar, Carlos, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Salsman, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanchez, Jeanette V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanders, Brenda F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanders, Fredrick D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanders, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sanguinetti, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Santiago, Jacinto, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Santiago, Maria D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Santoni, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sargent, Patrick D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sartorius, John A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sauer, Mary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sausville, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sawyer, Patrick A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sayre, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schaefer, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schaffer, Scott E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schaumann, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schenck, Henry K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schilling, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schmoeyer, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schneider, Kurt A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schoonover, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schrankel, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schuetze, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schumaker, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schwab, Elizabeth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schwend, Kristine L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scott, Laura L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scovil, Lewis B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scudder, Sara E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scullion, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seagraves, Keith D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seall, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seaton, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seawright, Dover, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sedlak, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Segars, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sellers, Fred F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sellers, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Severance, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffer, Matthew M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shalala, Jennifer A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shambo, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sharkey, Christopher W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sharp, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sharpless, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaughnessy, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaw, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheehan, Julia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sheeran, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shemwell, Christopher D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shepard, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sherrell, Cameron C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shipley, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shreve, Bartholomew U., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shubird, Patrick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shumar, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Silver, Michael O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Silverthorne, Jeffrey, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmers, Laura L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simmons, Jerome, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simon, Carl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simon, Christopher A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simontis, Nicholas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, Gerald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sinclair, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Singer, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Singer, Eric L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sipos, Eric P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slack, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Grant D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Gregory M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Irvin S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, John S., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Phillip G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Ronald E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Stanley O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Tracy O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smith, Walter F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Smyrski, John A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Somerville, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Soracco, Jeff D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Southerland, Joe D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sowell, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Soyk, Elmer R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spadie, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sparks, Andra D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spearman, Allan B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spears, Johnny L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spencer, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Speth, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spliss, Teresa A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spillman, Christopher L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Sprick, Mark A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Spruill, John T., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Squeri, Enrico J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Squire, Brendan E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stacy, Steven E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stanesa, Thomas N., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Starnes, David J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Steffens, Thomas C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stein, David A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stenzel, David J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stenzel, Donald D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stepanchuk, Edward C., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stepanek, Richard L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stern, Jack xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stern, Robert W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stevens, Charles B. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stevenson, Henry L., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Gregory xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Lee G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Napoleon W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Stephen G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stewart, Thomas S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stiehl, Hans E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stigall, Beatrice xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stiger, Donald A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stiltner, David K. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stokes, John E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stolzman, Michael D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stone, Steven W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stover, Curt E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Strickland, Jamie L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stuart, Deborah S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stuart, John A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stubbs, Johnnie L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sturgeon, Jack E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sublett, Chester A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sullivan, Robert P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Summerhill, William R., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sundin, Brian P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Susulco, Ignas T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sutherland, William R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sutton, Robert M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swagerty, John D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swallow, Anna C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sweeney, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swinney, Darla J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sykes, Timothy L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Szentkiralyi Zsolt I. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tackett, Everett E., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taitano, Patrick J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tapia, Marcos A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Brian A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Charles D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Christopher D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Harold W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Kip P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Kurt L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Shanda L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Teague, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Temple, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tengan, Jason L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Therolth, Janet xxx-xx-xxxx
 Theiler, Philip R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thill, Donna M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Bryan L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, David M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Frederick T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Jacquelyn K. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Lawrence A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Robert G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Steven N. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thomas, Teresa A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Andrew S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, David E., II xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Jonathan D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Larry M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Rebecca C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Sonya A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Theresa M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Vesen L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thornton, Mark R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thurlow, Nancy G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tighe, David E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tilley, James L. xxx-xx-xxxx

Timpte, Barbara S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tobin, Vincent M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Todd, Ronald C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tolar, David H. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tolman, Ruel C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tompkins, John L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tonner, Sheri L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toomajian, Martin E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toomey, Daniel A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tornes, Louis A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Torrico, George L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tosi, Peter R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tostrud, Douglas M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toutant, Harriet M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Toves, Francis P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tracy, Mark A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trahan, Ronald J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trammell, Martin L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Travis, David K. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tregre, Jacqueline R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tremaglio, Ralph J., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tremblay, Katherine M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trespalacios, Fernando xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tribble, Connie L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tribble, George G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trott, Nancy K. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Troy, James M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Truax, Marquerite L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Trulock, Troy E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tubbs, Steven O. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tucker, Clifford N. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tucker, Stephen T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tulak, Arthur N. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tupper, James J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turk, Patrick T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Jerry L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Turner, Matthew S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Upshaw, Gregg xxx-xx-xxxx
 Upson, Christopher S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Usinger, William E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanallen, Kenneth xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanbeuge, Robert S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanderlaan, Brian K. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vannoy, Sean M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vanrassen, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vaughn, Allen D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Venable, Barry E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vencil, Dwayne R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Venuto, Margaret M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vigil, Armando R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vilse, Michelle R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Villa, Thomas J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Villalobos, Juan C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Viola, James A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vincent, Susan J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vlahos, George S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vontersch, Robert L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Voss, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waggoner, Scott T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagner, Eric C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wagner, Marc A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wahlert, Douglas L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wait, Charles W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Waldeck, Jon C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Frederick xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Gregory xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Kevin xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Timothy K. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wallace, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walling, Daniel D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walls, Richard K., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walsh, Joseph R., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walter, Wayne E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walters, Eric A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walton, Thomas M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walworth, Mark E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wansley, Vicki J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, David L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Robert C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ward, Sean D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warmack, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Warring, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Washington, Andre xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wathne, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx

Watson, Brian T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Michael P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watson, Terri L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Watts, Kevin K. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wayman, Stephen E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weeks, Thomas H. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wehr, Michael C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weidenhammer, Christian D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weigel, Katherine V. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welborn, Kurt H. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Welch, Michael A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wells, Michael B. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wenstrup, Douglas B. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wentzel, Garth F. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wesloh, Kevin M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 West, Daniel T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Weston, Burton V., IV xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whalen, Brian R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whalen, Jason M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whalen, Michael C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whalen, Tim M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whelan, Brian T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whetstone, Michael L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Linda S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Stephen W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 White, Timothy P. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitehead, Sharon D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitesitt, Melody J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitney, William E., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitten, Jason J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wical, Steven C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wichers, Andrew W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wickham, Tracy L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiechmann, David A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wiedemann, Karl B. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wieler, Robert F., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wight, Wendy A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilcher, Anthony D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Andre R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Barton G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Brian A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, David M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Joel C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Russell D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Theodore C., IV xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Veronica E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williamson, Jeffrey D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willis, Twylla D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Willmuth, Thomas J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilsey, Donald G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Belford S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Christopher J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, David S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, David S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Jeffrey S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Leroy R., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Melvin A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Paul T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Walter C., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wingo, Jeffrey L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wirt, Paul G. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wirth, Julie L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wise, Barry D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wisecarver, David A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Witters, Mitchell A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woerle, Daral A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wojcik, Susan F. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolf, Wilbur E., III xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Charles E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, James T. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Jerry L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, John E. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Lawrence D. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Merinda J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wood, Paul W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodbury, Glen L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woodbury, Johnny C. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woolley, Jane F. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Worley, Charles J. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Worthington, Brenda M. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wozencraft, Robert xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wright, Michael A. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yoch, Casper R. xxx-xx-xxxx
 York, Elizabeth J. xxx-xx-xxxx

Young, Robert G. xxx-x-
 Zabel, Valerie J. xxx-x-
 Zachry, David S. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zarembo, Susan L. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ziegler, Adam C. xxx-xx-x-
 Zimmerman, Edward W. xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zimmerman, Randal J. xxx-xx-xxxx

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1, 1985:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert Dean Blackwill, of Maryland, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during the tenure of his service as the Representative of the United States of America for Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions Negotiations.

THE JUDICIARY

Kenneth F. Ripple, of Indiana, to be U.S. circuit judge for the seventh circuit vice a new position created by Public Law 98-353, approved July 10, 1984.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Paul A. Adams, of Maryland, to be inspector general, Department of Housing and Urban Development, vice Charles L. Dempsey, resigned.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

John D. Crawford, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1983, vice Earl Oliver, term expired.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370.

To be admiral

Adm. Steven A. White, xxx-xx-xxxx /1120, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code,

section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. George W. Davis, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx /1110, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James E. Service, xxx-xx-xxxx /1310, U.S. Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1985:

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

Daniel H. Carter, of Texas, to be a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science for a term expiring July 19, 1989.

The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named commodores of the line of the Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of rear admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be rear admiral

Dennis Matthew Brooks.
 Dudley Louis Carlson.

Jack Neal Darby.
 John Stephen Disher.
 James Francis Dorsey, Jr.
 Leon Albert Edney.
 Ronald Marvin Eytchison.
 William Miley Fogarty.
 Diego Edyl Hernandez.
 David Elmer Jeremiah.
 Stewart Andrew Ring.
 Robert Harper Shumaker.
 Richard Coghlan Ustick.
 Daniel Joseph Wolkenstorfer.

RESTRICTED LINE—ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

To be rear admiral

David Patrick Donohue.
 Myron Vernon Ricketts.

AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

To be rear admiral

William John Finneran.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Lincoln D. Faurer, xxx-xx-xxxx /U.S. Air Force.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning John T. Abbott, Jr., and ending Steven J. Zollmann, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 20, 1985.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning Philip Richard Albert, and ending Andrew Anthony Kannegieser, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 20, 1985.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JEANE KIRKPATRICK ON SEX
DISCRIMINATION

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, last December, then U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick gave a very interesting speech in which she talked candidly about the problems of sexism she had encountered in her appointed position as a major figure in the national security apparatus of the country. The point she makes transcends partisanship and particular administrations. Sadly, discrimination against women continues to be a serious problem in our society, and equally sadly, there are those in this society who seek to deny that fact. The experiences of Jeane Kirkpatrick speak powerfully in contradiction to those who would deny that sex discrimination is an ongoing problem in America.

After reading of Ambassador Kirkpatrick's speech, the gentlelady from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and I jointly wrote to Ambassador Kirkpatrick asking her to submit to us a copy of her remarks so we could insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that they could get the wide attention they deserve. I hope Dr. Kirkpatrick will continue her crusade against sexual discrimination—and perhaps she will even succeed, now that she has become a Republican, in getting that party's platform in 1988 to be more responsive to the needs of women in our society.

I ask that Ambassador Kirkpatrick's speech be printed here.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR JEANE J.
KIRKPATRICK

When I undertook the research on Political Woman in 1972 and wrote that book, which was published in 1974, I had not the slightest—repeat, slightest—premonition that I would one day find myself in public life in an active political role. I was a professor of political science and, by that time, my sons were all in junior high school or high school, busy with their own lives. I was moving into high gear, professionally—not only teaching, but doing research and writing as well, and was very happy doing it. Indeed, I continued to be very happy with that life right down to the point that I came to the United Nations.

But, as lawyers say, there came a day when I was sitting in the Situation Room at the White House—the Situation Room is a small room, underground, in the basement of the White House West Wing. There's a small table in the Situation Room around which eight or nine people gather fairly regularly to discuss major questions of foreign policy: the President, the Vice President,

the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Chief of the Joint Chiefs, the National Security Advisor, the Director of the CIA, Ed Meese and me. In the course of a meeting, I looked across the room and saw a mouse, making its way slowly with composure across the room. Someone else noticed it about the same time: "It's a mouse." They said: "A mouse? In the Situation Room?" And there he was: a mouse in the Situation Room. I thought to myself later: It might be that that mouse was no more surprising a creature to see in the Situation Room than I am—no stranger a presence, really, in the Situation Room, than I am.

I don't know whether I'm the only woman who has ever regularly sat around the table in the Situation Room. Certainly I'm the only woman who has regularly sat at the table in this Administration; but I have thought back to previous Administrations, and I suppose that I may be the only woman who has ever regularly sat at the table in the Situation Room. There are people who come and go in the room and among them is almost invariably a woman or two, fetching and carrying papers to the people who are sitting at the table. Has there ever been a woman, even as near to the center decision-making in U.S. foreign policy, as I am? I rather doubt it. Not under Carter, not under Ford or Nixon, not in the Johnson administration.

What's my point? My point is simply that the arenas of foreign affairs—diplomacy, defense—have been at its top levels a very peculiarly, particularly male bastion—more so than I had focused on until I found myself in it. On reflection it seems clear that the upper levels of foreign policy in all countries have been male redoubts. And it matters. This is where the very biggest decisions are made, the decisions that shape the destiny of the world. Mrs. Thatcher is, of course, inside that arena, and there have been a few others—Mrs. Gandhi, Mrs. Bandaranaike, plus a few queens like Elizabeth I and Isabella. But women have been present only when they were heads of state. Generally speaking, diplomacy, defense, international affairs, war and peace have been very exclusive male preserves.

It came as something of a shock to me to discover after being appointed to the United Nations that I was not only the first woman ever to head a United States Mission to the United Nations, but that I was the first woman ever to be a chief of mission of a country that falls in the category of Western civilization. (When I say Western, I mean Eastern Europe as well as Western Europe; the Soviet bloc as well as the NATO and ANZUS powers.) There had been a very few Third World missions headed by women for relatively brief periods, from Sri Lanka and Ghana for example; indeed, when I arrived at the U.N. there was another mission headed by a woman, Ambassador Jones of Liberia. But I discovered that I was also the first woman who had ever headed the mission of a major nation.

These facts alone make clear that the United Nations, like the Situation Room, has been a heavily male preserve. This, too, is not usually noticed nor commented upon. It's not even considered constructive to mention it. The reason the literature on

women in politics and women in power has not focused specifically on international affairs, on diplomacy and defense as distinctively male domains is that male preemption of these fields is so ubiquitous, so "normal," so taken for granted that it is virtually invisible, even to most women accustomed to thinking unthinkable thoughts about sex roles. But as someone who has read and written about women and power, I have become convinced that this pattern of sex role distributions is distinctive and important, conceivably even to the future of the world.

Of course, serving as U.S. Permanent Representative was not the first time I had found myself living in a largely male world. It was not the first time I had the experience of being the only woman at the table, so to speak. When I went to Georgetown University, it was still an overwhelmingly male college. I was not the first woman to become a tenured professor in my department, but I was the second. And I was the first woman to serve on the Rank and Tenure Committee, which is where the biggest academic decisions are made, decisions about the promotion and retention of academics—decisions that make and break careers. I served as the first and only woman on that committee for about seven years. Like Donna, I took part in a good many professional meetings and, again and again, had the experience of being the only woman on X or Y program, or at X or Y conference. I was the first woman appointed as a Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, which, as you doubtless know, is one of Washington's major think tanks in the public policy field. I am also the mother of sons, and so I had had lots of experience of living in a heavily male environment—and surviving.

But let me say as clearly as I can that my experience at the upper levels of American government, of our foreign policy decision-making process, at the upper levels of the United Nations, proves to me that it is much tougher there—much, much tougher there—than any experiences that I had ever encountered. There are a lot of jokes about academic politics, about how the reason that academic politics is so bitter is that the stakes are so low. The university is often said to be one of the meanest political arenas in the world. I say, "Don't believe it." Don't believe academic politics are the toughest politics in the world. The toughest politics in the world is politics.

To be sure, it's always difficult to know what, in one's experience, is idiosyncratic and what is generic. It's hard to know what part of what has happened to me has happened because of my particular character and personality, or because I serve with the Reagan Administration, and what part of what has happened to me has happened to me because I'm a woman. I understand very well the difficulties of making those kinds of judgments. I have studied those difficulties, thought about them and written about them. I can't quite prove it by the standards that I would like to be able to meet as a social scientist, I am nevertheless certain that a significant portion of my experience

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

is indeed sex-based, has happened to me because I am a woman.

I want to emphasize that I know I was something of an outsider for reasons other than sex. I was, after all, appointed to an Administration which deliberately sought a break from the past. The Reagan Administration was new; generally speaking it was not welcomed in the international field. I do not doubt that being a member of that Administration had some bearing on my experiences and my reception. Being a political appointee in the diplomatic field had some bearing on my experience. Being a lifelong Democrat serving in a Republican Administration surely had a bearing on my experiences, in our government and even in the United Nations. In the bureaucracy, being an intellectual in a government of lawyers, bureaucrats, businessmen mattered, too. In spite of it all, however, I feel quite sure that a significant portion of my experience has been shaped just by the fact of being a woman in those areas, where women are so very rare.

I would like to turn now to some special sex-related problems that I think I encountered; and if time permits I may work my way around to some special strengths that have been available by virtue of being a woman. But first, the special problems. They came as something of a surprise to me, most were almost wholly unanticipated. Obviously, if you, a woman, have lived in the professional world, qualified yourself and succeeded sufficiently to be appointed to a top-level job in politics, you've demonstrated not only professional skills, but some survivor skills as well. You've had some experience dealing with obstacles. I saw no reason to suppose that the quality of my experiences in this job should have been different. I was wrong.

One of the first big surprises I encountered was what, for what of a better word, I might call the process of de-qualification, by which I mean a sort of systematic inattention to my substantial academic background and success. This inattention stands in rather sharp contrast to the substantial attention that is routinely paid to the background of new appointees in new Administrations. I have thought, for example, about the fact that my research on women went almost wholly unnoticed, even though I wrote one whole book, a large part of another and a dozen monographs and essays on the subject. Indeed, that writing remains largely unnoticed to this day. That's interesting.

Also, largely unnoticed in public comments about me was the fact that I had spent much of my adult life studying and teaching the politics of foreign governments—Europe and the developing areas—or that I had special admiration for the British tradition, and special fascination with French politics, and deep concern for democratic institutions generally. None of these interests were esoteric. All were reflected in the courses I taught, the articles and books I wrote, the conferences I took part in. All were well known to my colleagues. Yet, again and again, I was described as a specialist on Latin American politics, which is not really accurate. I have a strong interest in the politics of some Latin nations, including Argentina, on whose political development I wrote a book, but I have no academic specialization in the region. I am not what is called in my profession, a "Latin Americanist." I explained that I was (and hope I still am) a specialist in the field of comparative politics. But almost no one took note.

A related manifestation of de-qualification occurred at a symbolic level, in such things as never being called either "Doctor" or "Professor," but always being called "Mrs." Now, I think "Mrs." is an honorable title; certainly it's an earned title, like "Doctor" and "Professor." But it's a non-differentiating, non-professional title. It simply remains a fact that titles are regularly attributed to the likes of Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Richard Gardner, or any one of a dozen men we could name, who come from universities to occupy significant posts at the upper levels of U.S. politics and are continually linked by title and by identifying description to academic expertise. The reverse happened with me and, as a matter of fact, happens to this very day. Instead of "Dr. Gardner, Columbia University professor of international law and former Ambassador to Italy," I am more likely to be described as "Mrs. Kirkpatrick, ideological hard-liner, favorite of conservatives." Who is Richard Gardner of the favorite of? Where was he a Professor, and of what?

There is another variety of sex-related, symbolic denigration, which I notice repeatedly, and about which I do not think I'm hypersensitive. I have been continually described as "schoolmarmish" or "a teacher," rather than "professorial" or a professor." I have almost never been described as a scholar, a term regularly applied to males with similar vitae. It was even suggested that my concern with speaking clearly is a boorish voice. In fact, it has more than once been implied that my speaking at all proves me a hopeless bore.

Now, the United Nations is an institution which specializes in talking. It's a place where people make speeches and listen to speeches. But if I make a speech, particularly a substantial speech, it has been frequently described in the media as "lecturing my colleagues," as though it were somehow peculiarly inappropriate, like an ill-tempered schoolmarm might scold her children. When I have replied to criticisms of the United States (which is an important part of my job), I have frequently been described as "confrontational." This is an interesting experience for me, since I had never been described as "confrontational" in my life before I went to the United Nations. I reflected a good deal on this "confrontational" label, and on what behavior is described as "confrontational," and whether it is more likely that a woman will be described as "confrontational" than a man. In the beginning I thought that I was described as "confrontational" because we adopted a policy inside the United Nations that, when the United States was publicly attacked, we would defend ourselves. We would address the charge and examine the record. That was a policy of the U.S. government. Interestingly enough, it was attributed to me, as a personal characteristic, as demonstrating that I was a confrontational person. It was a while before I noticed that none of my male colleagues, who often delivered more "confrontational" speeches than I, were labelled as "confrontational."

In thinking about this "confrontational" label, I have concluded that it is extremely unlikely that any woman who arrives at a very high level in any public activity is confrontational. If they were, they would have long since been eliminated. To achieve a significant level of recognition in our society, it is necessary to pass through numerous doors in which males are the gatekeepers. It is highly unlikely that any woman with a confrontational style would make it through more than one of those doors.

In fact, most successful women have become expert at avoiding confrontations. At Georgetown, for example, I managed to stay out of the most incredible faculty-administration "Star Wars," because I had learned to side-step conflicts.

I now think that being tagged as "confrontational" and being a woman in a high position are very closely related. There is a certain level of office the very occupancy of which constitutes a confrontation with conventional expectations. Similarly, I think being described as "tough" and being a woman in public life are very closely related. Again, this is an adjective that was never applied to me before I entered into high politics. Yet, it was not long before the French were calling me the "Femme de Fer," and our own papers were describing me repeatedly as "Reagan's Iron Woman," and most frequently as "tough." I've thought about that, too, and I've come to see here a double-bind: if a woman seems strong, she is called "tough;" and if she doesn't seem strong, she's found not strong enough to occupy a high level job in a crunch.

Terms like "tough" and "confrontational" express a certain very general surprise and disapproval at the presence of a woman in arenas in which it is necessary to be—what for males would be considered—normally assertive. Stereotyping has endless variations.

I have recently had a whole new set of adjectives applied to me. They also come as a surprise; they also are clearly sex-related. The key new term is "temperamental." Now, being called "temperamental" is a classically Victorian sexist charge against women. Noting that some six stories had appeared in which White House aides described me as "temperamental," too temperamental to occupy responsible office, one male colleague queried, "What do they mean? Too temperamental once a month?" Who is not familiar with the notion that women are a bit erratic, a bit unstable, hormonally disabled...? I found this one downright amusing. Not only is it anachronistic, it utterly ignores the fact that I have led the most extraordinarily stable life; I have lived in the same house for twenty-eight years, with the same husband, and had the same jobs. Even Dr. Edgar Berman has approved my performance.

Well, it's all very interesting. I also noticed, as I've watched the media treatment of Geraldine Ferraro or Ann Gorsuch-Burford, that there are some identifiable regularities in media response, although they were very different people and in very different roles, different from each other and from me.

What do I want to say about it all, finally? I want to say that I think that sexism is alive; it's alive in the United Nations, in the Secretariat; it's alive in the U.S. government; it's alive in American politics—I've seen enough, by the way, of Democratic politics at high levels to know that it's bipartisan. And I also want to say that sexism is not unconquerable, if one can avoid getting and staying angry and wasting one's energies on rage. I don't know how many of you have recently read *A Room of One's Own*, which remains my own favorite feminist classic. In that beautiful essay, Virginia Woolf talks about the pitfalls of anger for women, of wasting one's energy, one's self, on rage. I think that's very important, because if one is angry much of the time, that anger unbalances one's judgment, consumes one's energy. If you can avoid the pitfalls of rage and paranoia and can hang in long enough to prove seriousness and compe-

tence, then I find, in the diplomatic world and in American high politics, too, then you can develop good relations based on mutual respect with almost all your colleagues. In the U.N. that applies to representatives of countries that don't even grant legal equality to women.

But that is not the end of the inquiry. I still think, even more clearly than when I wrote *Political Women or The New Presidential Elites*, that the life-style in high politics and government may be peculiarly unattractive to women. I find myself thinking of the number of women, the relatively high percentage of women, who withdraw from high politics and government by personal decision—not because they can't hack it, but because they don't choose to. High politics involves a weirdly unbalanced kind of life-style, which requires continuous involvement with power. It is not only necessary to work eighty or ninety-hour weeks; that is true of many vocations. It is that the whole enterprise resembles that described by Thomas Hobbes: you know, the "restless striving after power which [one suspects] ceaseth only in death."

I don't know what styles of interaction would be like in politics and government if there were enough women there to affect the way in which business is conducted. Today, any one woman present, whether it's in the UN Security Council, or in our National Security Council, or in the decision arenas of any major power process in our society today, adapts to a male pattern of interaction. To do that for long, you have to like it a lot. You have to need it a lot.

We are back here with the ultimate questions of whether there are identifiable male and female sensibilities and social styles. I tend to think there are; and I tend to think that the patterns of interaction in high politics are peculiarly unattractive to women, that is, to most women I have known (and to me, I might add), as I think these social processes are unattractive to most women as they are inhospitable to them. Neither of these tendencies—if they exist—portend a rapid influx of women into top positions in government, least of all foreign policy.

Why don't I just stop there? If anybody would like to put a question to me, I will do my best to answer it.

Question: I thought that was an extraordinary analysis. Let me ask you whether it makes any substantive difference that women are in high politics, and foreign policy in particular, in your observations?

Amb. KIRKPATRICK: I don't know, Donna; I think this is where one confronts the fact there are so few women that it's hard to know whether any differences that are made by their presence are attributable to idiosyncratic or to sexual factors. In my own research on women and politics, I found—I don't know whether that was a particular period either—that the only identifiable substantive differences between women and men on issues tended to involve the use of force, with a particular reluctance of a marginal sort among women; not a statistically significant difference, but still a discernible difference with regard to attitudes about the use of force. I don't know whether this would apply at the decision-making levels or not. Let me say, I have never personally advocated, suggested or even accepted for that matter the use of force as a solution to a foreign-policy problem in my life. And it's a very interesting fact, because I had a reputation to the contrary. This whole business of image and substance has been very, very strange in my case. Some of it, I'm sure, is

due to being a woman, but I don't know whether that's sex-specific or whether it's idiosyncratic. I just think we have to wait until there are more women in top decision posts to determine with any kind of reliability whether women will in fact behave significantly different substantively than their male colleagues. I think we just have to say, we don't know yet.

Question: Either in academe or in political life, do you have any experience or evidence of any changes in the general sexes and for the younger generation coming along; the kids now in their late twenties, early thirties—perhaps even in your staff, people saying that this . . . ?

Amb. KIRKPATRICK: Well, certainly in the academic world, yes. But let me say that the resistances to women are much greater in what I would call high politics and diplomacy than in the academic world. I've been interested in the experiences of young women in the Foreign Service, of course. For example, I've had an unusual number of professional women from the Foreign Service at U.S.U.N.—one of whom is here today; Sally Grooms, stand up. Another woman here today, Irene Payne, is also on my staff at U.S.U.N. By the way, at U.S.U.N., you don't have to have very many women for it to be an unusual number. My sense is that there are lots of resistances still for young women in our diplomatic service. The U.N. is such an overwhelmingly male place that I don't think there is any opportunity to observe any trends there. But in the academic world, surely, yes.

Question: Dr. KIRKPATRICK, I'm sure when you are mentioning women world leaders, you didn't mean to leave out Golda Meir.

Amb. KIRKPATRICK: Oh, I certainly didn't.

Question: My question is this: do you think some of the terms that have been used to describe you emanated from the media or emanated from some other place, such as the White House, and the media picked them up.

Amb. KIRKPATRICK: I don't know. Journalists themselves make decisions like titles; and journalists themselves make decisions about what they include in how they characterize people. What I would say about journalism is that it is—like most other power processes in our society, and in all other societies, I hate to say—overwhelmingly male as you get near the top, the top being prestige papers like the New York Times, the Washington Post and so forth. I'm sure it's the result of an interaction process and, in any case, is not ultimately disabling. Let me just say again that in my experience none of it is ultimately disabling. What it does is make difficult jobs somewhat more difficult, but it doesn't make them impossible. I'm sure that Alexander Haig thought he was going to wipe me out in the first nine months in the job, and he didn't, if I may say so, and it's important to me that he did not do it.

Question: I would like you to talk about positives.

Amb. KIRKPATRICK: I would be very happy to do that; I was just afraid I was talking too long. I expected and experienced some positive things, too. I think that particularly with foreign political leaders, like foreign ministers and heads of state, and with some of our own as well, I think that a woman is less threatening and perceived as less competitive; and that it is therefore easier, perhaps, to have long conversations. It is easier, maybe, because it creates a more hospitable environment for them to talk freely. I have developed, really, quite a lot of quite close

personal relationships with foreign leaders—this, by the way, is something else that is not generally ever noted—on the basis of long sessions, in which I listened an hour-and-a-half, two hours, three hours, six hours in some cases. And I think I learned extraordinarily interesting and useful things, too, and acquired insights about the foreign policy processes, or the diplomatic process and goals, in their countries. Something about being a woman expedites that process.

I think, for example, with Africans, Latin Americans and Asians, very frequently it's easier to establish easy, warm, non-competitive kinds of relations for me than for a male in the same position. There's a quality of warmth that women can frequently more easily establish with male colleagues, particularly in arenas like the U.N. I'm sure Gillian [Sorenson] feels the same thing, don't you, Gillian? I certainly do; it's been my experience—it's part of the first quality I mentioned. I can't think of any advantages to being a woman in U.S. politics, frankly, except that maybe one gets special kinds of looks from one's—can one say—fellow women? That's about it. There aren't really equal advantages. The advantages don't equal the disadvantages, I think.

Question: I wonder if you could contrast your experiences a bit with those of late-comers like Margaret Heckler and Elizabeth Dole. I'm specifically wondering how much of what you've experienced could be the negative perception that the post of U.N. Ambassador generally has had. I know that Daniel Patrick Moynihan was considered confrontational and temperamental; Andy Young was considered a loudmouth, and Arthur Goldberg said many times that he considered it the worst career move he ever made, to leave the Supreme Court, because it was—

Amb. KIRKPATRICK: It's a bad job, there's no doubt it. It's a very bad job. It's a difficult job; there is a lot of rivalry and resentment felt by the State Department about U.N. ambassadors generally, and that makes the difficult job more difficult to do, too. I think you'd have to ask Liddy Dole and Margaret Heckler, though, about their experiences. I don't think we've ever had the kind of conversation that would quite provide a basis. Liddy Dole's situation is very particular because of her husband, if I may say so. Her husband and his position in the Republican ranks in the Senate is a powerful source of strength to her—no doubt about that at all. Margaret Heckler's position would be more comparable to mine, because she's there by herself, so to speak. And she and I someday almost surely ought to join with Gerry Ferraro and a couple of others, maybe in a panel, in which we talk about those experiences. But we haven't done it yet.

Question: [Certainly?], given the quality that you've just talked about in terms of cultivating relationships, and listening, and the rapport that you've established. We also recognize that information is power, and I think I overheard you, or participated at a cocktail party where you said informally that one of the blocks that you had to deal with, and I think in the context of your talk today it's apropos, is the proverbial men's room, where that bit of information that may be critical to decision-making, is just not imparted to you. Do you therefore have to deploy your staff somewhat differently as a woman, to fill in those kinds of voids and gaps?

Amb. KIRKPATRICK. I don't know. Let me just say, there are still places like Burning Tree and the Bohemian Grove and so forth, where guys go together and relax and that sort of thing. And Washington is a men's club town. I don't feel that so strongly, though, at the U.N. I have good friends today at top levels of our government, and I think, in a general kind of way, I get the information I need. Information isn't enough, I may tell you; but I get the information I need. At the U.N., there are five U.S. Ambassadors, and the other four are male; they depoly themselves all over the system. I couldn't function without them.

Question. So many of us who appreciate your contribution to this country are naturally wondering, do you know what your next assignment will be?

Amb. KIRKPATRICK. I'll tell you, with what is called my "characteristic candor," two things. One is, I never intended to be in public life; I began these remarks by saying that. I consider myself fundamentally an intellectual and a private person; I enjoy private life a lot. For a political scientist to have sat long enough in the Cabinet room to grow bored there sometimes—that's interesting. But for a political scientist, and I'm a serious political scientist, to have access to the levels of decision-making at which I have been able to participate and observe, is an absolutely fascinating and unexampled kind of experience.

But I would like to be very clear that I like private life a lot. And my fundamental life commitments have not really changed as a consequence of the last four years. That said, I would also say that I made a commitment to the President, in my last conversation with him two or three weeks ago, that I was not going to make any public comments about my plans, or my future, as we call it; and he was not going to make any public comments; and that anything anybody read, they would know came from somebody besides either of us, who happen to be the only two people that are really involved in those decisions. Okay? Thank you very much. ●

PHIL SCHWARTZ: A VERY SPECIAL MAN

HON. MICKEY EDWARDS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there's a city in my State, a very unique city. It's a city of small-town men with big-city dreams and an awesome sense of perspective.

The city is Bartlesville, OK, and I love it because it loves itself. And because I have found in that city men and women of a very special make.

Bartlesville is known for the Phillips Petroleum Co. But it is not its companies which are Bartlesville's strength. Bartlesville is populated by a unique kind of person. One wonders how, in the future, this small city can replace the sort of men and women who live there now.

That thought came to me when Bryan Whitworth called me from Bartlesville to tell me that Phil Schwartz had died.

Bryan is one of Phillip's executives. We had worked together closely, and almost daily, in the fight to save Phillips—and Bartlesville—from a hostile corporate takeover, and in the midst of that very real crisis for Phillips and its thousands of employees, what we often talked about—Bryan and I, and Marty Garber, and others—what we talked about was Phil Schwartz.

Bryan called that day because he knew I loved Phil Schwartz, and when he told me that Phil had died, I was stunned and I felt a sudden deep emptiness.

How could one be so shocked at the death of a man whose death had been expected on a daily basis for many months? Because Phil Schwartz had defied death for so long, through so many heart attacks, that we had begun to think him incapable of dying. He had resisted death not with stubbornness and clenched teeth but with a gentle grace, not iron fists pounding at the doors that threatened to close on him, but a soft, bouncing ball that simply kept bouncing.

Who was this Phil Schwartz, that his death meant so much to me? Was this an uncle, a friend since high school, a foxhole buddy from some distant war? The truth is, I hadn't even known Phil until some 4 years ago, when the Oklahoma Legislature, by some imaginative gerrymandering, had stretched my congressional district beyond any reasonable shape and put Bartlesville—and Phil Schwartz—into the Fifth District. Before that, the people of Bartlesville had been closer to the Fifth District of Kansas, than that of Oklahoma.

Phil Schwartz was one of the first people I came to know in Bartlesville; one of the first to befriend, and take under his wing, a stranger from the distant city. Phil was always there. He drove for 3 hours to get to Oklahoma City—and for 3 hours more to get back home—to attend fundraising dinners. He got up early to ride a bus to another city to help with a whistlestop campaign trip through central Oklahoma. When I hired a new chief of staff, I took her to Bartlesville, and the first place we stopped was in Phil and Lynn Schwartz' living room.

Is this, then, what made Phil so special? That he helped with my campaigns? That he opened his house to me?

What made Phil Schwartz so special was that through all this he was fighting daily against death, working in his community, being a strong husband to Lynn—who suffered both her own illness and her fear for Phil—and being a gentle and loving father to an exceptional son.

Phil's great heart was worn out from overuse. Again and again it collapsed. Doctors operated until there was nothing left to operate on. He was in Houston, waiting to receive a new heart,

when he died. I had called him at the hospital in Houston, but what I remember as our last conversation was a visit we had before that while he was in a hospital in Bartlesville. Phil had been afraid to have a heart transplant—partly, I suspect, because his mind was more on Lynn and Justin, and what the cost of the operation would do to them. He joked that he was afraid to get a new heart because he'd heard that such operations changed one's personality. I joked that that would be a good enough reason for us to urge him to do it as soon as possible.

In the end, I suspect that Phil died because it would have been unthinkable for any other heart to be in this gentle man's body. Phil's great heart was Phil.

Phil was not a part of my daily life, and it seems trite to say "we'll miss you, Phil," but I know that I will never again drive into Bartlesville without seeing Phil Schwartz at every place we had ever been together, and feeling a bit empty. The world is diminished by the loss of Phil Schwartz. And so am I. ●

THE REAGAN TAX CUTS

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article from the Sunday, March 31 edition of the New York Times. This article clearly demonstrates that the Reagan tax reductions have actually increased the taxes received from upper income earners:

AS REAGAN PROMISED, THE RICH PAY MORE

(By James D. Gwartney and Richard L. Stroup)

Some people still consider the 1981 Reagan tax cut as welfare for the rich—or, to quote the Rev. Jesse Jackson, a "reverse Robin Hood process, taking from the poor and giving to the rich." But newly released figures from the Internal Revenue Service on 1983 tax returns show that the tax cut had just the opposite effect. After the cut, the rich paid more and carried a larger share of the total, while the poor paid less. Lower taxes encouraged the rich to earn more taxable income and shelter less—that is, to spend more time with engineers, clients and market researchers and less time with tax attorneys and accountants.

This picture emerges when we look at the changes in tax payments for those earning more than \$75,000 in 1981—the top 1.36 percent of taxpayers. Assuming normal personal deductions, these taxpayers faced marginal tax rates above 50 percent, before the 1981 legislation. Not only did they get an across-the-board tax cut, as did all taxpayers, but they also benefited dramatically from the reduction in the top bracket to 50 percent from 70 percent.

With such a big cut, many people would expect this group to pay much less tax. In fact, the top 1.36 percent paid 10.9 percent more in taxes in 1983 than in 1981. Moreover, they paid a greater share of total taxes than at any time in the past 15 years—23.3 percent of the total tax in 1983, compared with 20.4 percent in 1981. In contrast, the bottom half of income recipients paid 7.1 percent in 1983, down from 7.5 percent in 1981.

Why did the rich end up paying more despite the lowered tax rates? The major reason is that taxes change incentives. Consider the change in incentives for someone in the top bracket. At the 70 percent marginal tax rate, an added dollar gains only 30 cents for the earner. But after the tax cut, the earner keeps 50 cents of each additional dollar—a whopping 67 percent increase in the incentive to earn. Hiding income in tax shelters yields less, while finding ways to cut business costs and increase sales yields a higher return.

With this greater incentive, executives spend less on plush offices and Hawaii conferences—both tax-deductible business expenses—and more on the business of satisfying customers. Surgeons, lawyers and other professionals spend more time in the office and less on the golf course. In each case, the driving force is a greater incentive to earn, since each additional dollar is worth 50 cents, rather than 30 cents. As a result, their taxable incomes rise.

When the I.R.S. data for 1982 showed that the rich were paying a greater share of taxes, many critics resisted the incentives explanation. Some argued that the tax burden shifted to the rich because the 1982 recession cut income growth among lower- and middle-income groupings. However, since we now see that the same pattern was present during the economic boom of 1983, the "recession-caused-it" explanation has lost its credibility.

Critics also argued that the rapid growth of the upper-income tax base was a "bubble" effect, reflecting temporary capital gains from the boom in the stock market. The problem with the "bubble" theory is that capital gains are too small—only about 10 percent of gross income for the top 1.36 percent of taxpayers—to bring about major changes in the distribution of income.

Instead, employment and business income—drove the growth of taxable income in the top brackets. The wages and salaries of the top 1.36 percent of earners were 20.7 percent higher in 1983 than in 1981.

Income changes in the categories of businesses and partnerships are particularly important, since they often provide tax shelter opportunities. The taxable income of the top 1.36 percent of taxpayers from business and professional practices, partnerships and small-business corporations rose from \$13.7 billion in 1981 to \$20.6 billion in 1983, an astounding gain of 50 percent in two years.

It is true that lower tax rates reduced the value of tax shelter investments and increased the value of assets that yielded taxable income, such as stocks and bonds. This pushed up stock and bond prices, reflecting the movement of resources away from tax-favored investments toward those generating high real returns. Was this bad?

The "bubble" theory is also inconsistent with the time dimension of decision-making. Few taxpayers sell their old tax-shelter investments as soon as rates go down. But they make fewer new shelter investments. It

takes time to move resources into more productive, unsheltered investments. Thus, the expansion of taxable income from the 1981 tax cut will continue for some years.

A larger economic pie can mean a larger slice for everyone. The 1981 tax cuts increased the incentive of those in high tax brackets to earn income. These taxpayers applied less of their scarce time, energy and money to low-return tax shelters and more to projects yielding higher returns. They increased productivity and expanded G.N.P. We all benefit from a better-supplied marketplace and, on April 15, we benefit again because the rich pay more. ●

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

HON. TIMOTHY J. PENNY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. This year more than 300,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the six national scholarships which are awarded as top prizes. The contest theme this year was "My Pledge to America."

I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the winning script from the State of Minnesota as delivered by Maria Deonne Haack who lives on Rural Route 1, Box 87, Oronoco, MN. Maria is the 17-year-old daughter of Marvin and Ginger Haack and is a senior at Pine Island High School where she participates in many school activities, including the National Honor Society. Maria also serves as the Minnesota State president of the Future Homemakers of America. The residents of Minnesota's First Congressional District and I are justifiably proud of this accomplished young woman.

The script follows:

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

(By Maria D. Haack)

Ladies and Gentlemen, welcome to the American Theatre. This evening's performance will be "An American Pledge". Our cast consists of one player in the role of . . . well, in the role of all characters. Curtain time will be from this day forward.

I am a student and my pledge to America is this: I will take advantage of my opportunities in quality education. I may not discover a miracle cure, I may not write the great American novel, I may not negotiate a major peace plan. However, I will keep my mind open to new and innovative thoughts and insights, I will expand my horizons, I will strive to reach my academic potential as is the American privilege. I am only one, but in America, I can make a difference.

I am a Christian. The windows of stained glass in my house of worship are lit warmly on any given Sunday morning, and not only there am I free to practice my faith, I pray in my home, give thanks in my day to day living, share my beliefs with those who are lost or need comfort. All of this I shall con-

tinue as a pledge and promise to this country. I am only one, but in America, I can make a difference.

I am a daughter. Within that simple title I carry many responsibilities. For example, my ancestors founded what is known today as the greatest nation on earth—The United States of America. I pledge to those great minds and hearts a continuing reverence and upkeep of their accomplishments. My parents have instilled in me appreciation for this country. Therefore, I pledge to do the same for my children so that they may not blindly take advantage of what this country is and what it has to offer. I am only one, but in America, I can make a difference.

I am a citizen. What a beautiful phrase really, it can be used in many different contexts. I am a citizen: honor and gratitude. I may pledge my loyalty. Let me give in return for all I have received.

And then you may say: "I am a citizen." Pride and a bit of boastfulness. In wartime and peace I pledge to defend old glory and the land she waves freely over. You know the song. When it is played I place my hand over my heart and join in the singing. Do you get misty-eyed, too? That is one of the great benefits of patriotism.

Finally, I am a citizen. I, as in an individual. I, as in a part of the whole. I am only one, but in America I can make a difference.

I am a teenager. What sort of pledge would a mere teenager take on? I answer you in all sincerity. I, along with millions of my fellow teenagers symbolize the future. We are tomorrow's leaders, tomorrow's privileged voters, farmers, business people, industrial workers, members of congress, the government. I pledge to aid in restoration of America's past. I pledge to strive, along with my peers, for continued peace and prosperity in an often chaotic and unstable world. "I pledge allegiance . . ." a familiar pledge, but no less meaningful or sincere because of its familiarity. I am a teenager—only one teenager—but in America I can make a difference.

As the curtain closes and the house lights come up, ladies and gentlemen, pay close attention to our cast member. She has no make-up to remove, no costume to change from. And she has no character to step out of. Instead, she returns home as a continuance of this evening's performance. You see, "An American Pledge" is no fictional play. It is, indeed a true commitment and a real life drama. ●

SOUTH AFRICA: WHY IT'S "A BAD INVESTMENT"

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, increasingly, an overwhelming majority of Americans agree that we should do all that we can to bring an end to the oppressive, racist system by which a small minority of white South Africans tyrannizes over the nonwhite majority in that country.

But we continue to have major differences over how best to shape our policies—toward this end. Some have argued that, while they too abhor apartheid, calls for an end to Ameri-

can investment in that country are impractical and show too little economic sophistication. So it was particularly interesting to me to read an article in Sunday's Boston Globe by one of the most thoughtful, sophisticated, and successful businessmen in New England, Jerry Dunfey, in which he makes the case for disinvestment on both moral and economic grounds.

This eloquent and reasoned statement, coming as it does from a person of Jerry Dunfey's credentials as a creative business developer and manager greatly bolsters the case for strong sanctions against the inhumane South African regime. It is wholly consistent with the work that Jerry Dunfey and his family have done for years to show that the successful practice of capitalism is enhanced by strong moral sense. I insert his letter to 46 American corporations explaining why the Dunfey family has decided not to hold stock in any company investing in South Africa here:

SOUTH AFRICA: WHY IT'S "A BAD INVESTMENT"

I am writing to explain why the Dunfey family will no longer hold stocks in [your corporation] or in any other company which invests in South Africa.

I was in that country in January and saw for myself the twisted face of apartheid. I saw the single-sex hostels outside Johannesburg where fathers and husbands are forced to live 11 months a year separated from their wives and children, condemned to exist in squalor and isolation, because apartheid denies their families even the most elementary rights of citizenship and free movement inside their own country. I saw the resettlement camp at Onverwacht, a treeless, desolate desert where hundreds of people have been forced to move simply because their skin is black. When I hear about "progress" in South Africa, I think of the fastest-growing part of Onverwacht—the cemeteries filled with the bodies of young children who have died in infancy due to the conditions of the camp and the lack of medical care. (The government official in charge of the camp at first said seven doctors lived there, then retracted that claim, then took us to a medical clinic where no doctor was on duty.)

So it was across South Africa. I will never forget, for example, the proud, gentle people I encountered during my visit to Crossroads, an unauthorized settlement near Cape Town, who asked only that they be allowed to live in peace and human dignity. Just a month later, some of them were shot down by South African police, and many more were injured, during a protest against the government's plan for their forced removal.

I also heard what is often referred to as "the other side" of the story in meetings with business leaders and government officials. Yet the so-called political "reforms" which they cited have in fact only deepened the rift between the minority white community and the vast majority of South Africans who are black. I was told of economic progress, yet in many respects the disparities between whites and blacks are becoming greater. Corporations which portray themselves as a force for change are, in many cases, the same companies which are enforcing the notorious 3 percent rule, under

which only 3 percent of black miners can bring their families with them to the mine-site, while all white miners can. These companies are, in effect, active partners in an intolerable racism.

Taken steps and half measures are an increasingly transparent mask which cannot conceal the true face of apartheid. Real progress, I am convinced, depends on three changes: an end to the denationalization of black South Africans; movement toward full political rights for all South Africans; and the repeal of apartheid in all its forms.

I heard the excuse that disinvestment or economic sanctions will hurt only blacks, or that it will not work. The argument, curiously, came from whites, who seemed remarkably exercised about something which, in the next breath, they dismissed as "ineffective." As black people repeatedly said to me, this was one of the few times they had ever seen such solicitude for their conditions from the very forces which were profiting from it. And as one black father in his mid-30s said, "It was 15 years ago when I first got the explanation that sanctions would hurt blacks. I wish they had hurt me then, so my son wouldn't be hurting so much now."

I do not deny that business has done some good in South Africa. But now, finally, the fundamental issue must be faced. They relate to the very nature of the South African system—which is the only explicitly racist system still openly, even proudly, proclaimed to the world. For my family and for me, given the suffering I saw, this is a basic moral question. As a businessman, I also think it involves economic good sense. Some day, all South Africans will have their rightful say in the running of their country. Is it really prudent for American business to invest on the side of the present regime, under its rules and in complicity with it? Is it really prudent to identify ourselves with the apartheid system at the very moment when black South Africans are beginning to look—in my view, mistakenly but understandably—to Marxism and the Soviet Union as a source of hope, primarily because they regard capitalism and American as helpmates of their oppressors?

I believe it is vitally important to reverse that trend and to put both our country and our companies on the side of freedom. In any accounting that calculates beyond the short-term, both principle and profit should move us in that direction. In any case, as individuals, the members of my family cannot continue to invest in corporations which making wrong investments from a moral perspective—and bad investments from a business perspective.

We intend to urge others to make the same decision we have made.

THE TRAGEDY OF AFGHANISTAN

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● **Mr. BROOMFIELD.** Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is slowly turning Afghanistan into a satellite state. I am deeply concerned about the rape of that once peaceful country, and I want to recommend an excellent article describing the most recent Soviet strategy for subduing that land.

The initial Soviet strategy of fighting the Afghani Freedom Fighters failed. Now, the Soviets are trying to depopulate the countryside. Villages are being bombed out of existence, and their inhabitants are being slaughtered. Agricultural land and farm animals are also being eliminated and new waves of refugees are flooding into neighboring Pakistan. Already, Pakistan has over 3 million Afghani refugees.

A model Soviet state is being set up with all the trappings of communism. The Government of Afghanistan is essentially being managed by Soviets and the state-controlled Afghani media tell of the great accomplishments of their Soviet saviors. Young Afghani children are being sent to the Soviet Union for long-term indoctrination and training, and the Afghani intelligence service is now a classic model of the KGB. The history of Afghanistan is being rewritten by Soviet historians who will tell how Afghanistan was rescued by Soviet soldiers.

As we watch this sad chapter in history unfold before our very eyes, I have real reason to doubt the often acclaimed peaceful intentions of the Kremlin. When and where possible, the Soviets will continue to absorb neighboring states. The Kremlin will also project its power into distant regions of the world by assisting and using surrogates. Struggling democracies will be destabilized by so-called guerrillas for national liberation.

Let us hope that the brave freedom fighters in Afghanistan will continue to make the Soviet invaders pay a high price for their most recent effort to expand the Soviet empire.

With these concerns in mind, I suggest that my colleagues in the Congress read the following excerpts from the New York Times article on Afghanistan.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1985]

REMAKING AFGHANISTAN IN THE SOVIET IMAGE

(By Richard Bernstein)

PESHAWAR—A dusty, frontier city in northern Pakistan, lying just down the road from the Khyber Pass, is a place full of terrible stories these days. There is, for example, the tale of Mohammed Qasim Yusufi, a soft spoken, 33-year-old former professor of agriculture at Kabul University, in neighboring Afghanistan, whose experience aptly sums up the disastrous events in his country since the Soviet Union invaded it on Dec. 27, 1979.

Mr. Yusufi felt, after several years of life under what the Afghans officially called the Saur, or April, Revolution that life had become untenable, so he decided to get out. Shortly before he left, he saw on Afghanistan's state-run television a news program about his native village, a place called Behsoud, once a collection of mud-brick houses with about 100 farming families. The television program showed Behsoud as a happy place: land reform was progressing, feudalism was being wiped out, support for the Communist revolution was growing among the villagers. Behsoud lies, it happens, near

the route from the capital, Kabul, to the Pakistan border. Because the village was his birthplace, Mr. Yusufi paid a final visit to it on his way into exile.

"If you go to my village," he said, evoking the difference between reality and the propaganda image, "you will see that it has been destroyed. You won't find more than five families there. The village has been terribly bombed."

Behsoud's condition is shared by many, perhaps most, villages in Afghanistan; Mr. Yusufi and other Afghan refugees contend. The Soviet Union, in its efforts to weaken support for the mujahedeen, the anti-Soviet resistance fighters, has started intense aerial bombardments of rural areas. The United Nations Human Rights Commission said in a recent report that the Soviet strategy is aimed apparently at forcibly evacuating large stretches of countryside. Refugees say that entire areas, such as the Panjshir Valley, northwest of Kabul, have been virtually abandoned. The policy has left an unknown number dead or displaced and created havoc in Afghan agriculture. A study prepared by Azam Gul, like Mr. Yusufi a former professor of agriculture at Kabul University, found that the output of wheat, corn and rice fell by 1982 to roughly one-quarter the levels of 1978. A study by some British doctors, based on information collected by Afghan refugees dispatched secretly to all parts of the country, concluded that malnutrition among children is prevalent and that famine threatens thousands of people. Yet, the Soviet-inspired news media, reporting on Behsoud and other villages in Afghanistan, routinely profess land reform and rural progress.

"In Behsoud village there is land and there is water, but there is no agriculture," Mr. Yusufi said. "The irrigation system has been destroyed. There are no farmers to cultivate the land."

Taken individually, perhaps, stories like that of Mohammed Qasim Yusufi are not of staggering dimensions, not by the standards of our bloody century. Taken together, however, and added to the information that has leaked from an Afghanistan that the Soviet Union has attempted to seal off from independent outside observation, the stories suggest that Soviet policy in Afghanistan is as audacious and ruthless as any the Russians have ever carried out in their satellite states. The Afghanistan that emerges in the refugees' accounts is a country not simply being subdued militarily by the Soviet Union but being remade in the Russians' own totalitarian image.

Several years ago, the way Afghan refugees tell it, the country's pro-Soviet leaders said that there only needed to be one million Afghans left in the country. They were quoted by refugees as saying that a revolutionary society could be constructed on that slender basis, even if the rest of the prewar population of 16 million were to flee or be destroyed. In fact, there is no absolute proof available in the West that the Afghan leaders made precisely that grim, bleak formulation. But the statement is consistent with what seems to be the guiding principle of the two complementary sides of the Soviet and Afghan Communist undertaking.

The first element is to strip away those who are troublesome, to sweep away the old and the inconvenient—and, in Afghanistan's crusty, feudal society, there is much that is old and inconvenient. The vast depopulation that has already occurred—one of history's great migrations—seems to be a result of this effort. One-third of the prewar popula-

tion has already fled to Pakistan, Iran and other countries. Many others—nobody knows exactly how many—have left their homes in the countryside for the relatively safe cities, fleeing the bombardments that have become a regular part of the Soviet strategy.

The second, and less conspicuous, element suggested by Mr. Yusufi's evocation of the propaganda machinery now operating in Afghanistan, is an attempt to transfer onto Afghan soil the methods and institutions of the Soviet Union itself. This, as the Russians are finding out, will take some doing outside the urban areas. The people of the Afghan countryside, fiercely traditional, deeply religious, have always resisted control by any kind of central government, particularly any foreign government. Nonetheless, the Russians are striving to create, from a kind of ground zero if necessary, a new and more malleable society, one whose basic character harks back to the structures invented by Lenin and which have been implanted in such places as Eastern Europe and Indochina. "They are not that much concerned with the amount of territory controlled by the mujahedeen," Abdul Majid Mangal, a former diplomat in the Afghan Communist government and now a refugee in Peshawar, said. "Their strategy is to create nuclei of Sovietized society in the cities they control and to spread outward from them to the rest of the country."

There has been much speculation on why the Soviet Union is persisting in these policies in Afghanistan in the face of the huge financial burden an occupation force of 115,000 troops entails, not to mention the 10,000 Soviet soldiers killed in the war so far and the enormous propaganda loss Moscow has suffered elsewhere in the world. For its part, the Soviet Union says its aim is to protect the balance of power on its own borders by supporting Afghanistan's socialist revolution against "imperialist" countries, by which it means the United States, Pakistan and China. The Russians also stress that they are promoting "progressive" changes, providing scientific education, bringing about the equality of women and ending the reign of the old "exploiting classes."

The most widespread view in the West of the Soviet objectives is that the Russians are pushing southward, as they have throughout their history, seeking strategic advantage in South Asia and in the area of the Persian Gulf. Some commentators in the United States have argued that the Russians, in seeking this objective will try to absorb Afghanistan as a new republic of the Soviet Union in much the same fashion as it absorbed Kazakhstan, Tadzhikistan and the other Central Asian domains after the 1917 Revolution.

Abdul Majid Mangal is a former career diplomat in the Kabul Government whose last post was as the second-ranking official in the Afghan Embassy in the Soviet Union. Like Mr. Yusufi, he left for Pakistan in 1983. He said that in Kabul, Jalalabad, Herat, Kandahar and the other major urban areas of the country, Soviet-style institutions are already well established. He has a long list of them: the propaganda machinery, the state-controlled newspapers, the professional associations, the branches of the Communist Party in every neighborhood, office and school. There is also, of course, the secret police, or, as it is called after its Afghan initials, Khad, modeled on the K.G.B., the Soviet Union's own tentacular security apparatus. Soviet advisers have been placed at every level of government,

where they control even the routine exercises of administration. The school system, from kindergartens to universities, has been revamped. Thousands of young people are sent to the Soviet Union for their educations, including children as young as 5 or 6 years old who are destined to stay for a decade. It is estimated that some 12,000 Afghans are now studying at various universities and training institutes in the Soviet Union.●

ABUSES IN JOB TRAINING ACT

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, my State senator, Bill Greene, chairman of the California Senate Committee on Industrial Relations, recently circulated a letter to his colleagues about abuses in the Job Partnership Training Act [JPTA].

My senator was referring to two articles which appeared in fall 1984 issue of Personnel Consultant—Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA]—a "New Source of Income" and "The Job Service—Your Involvement Now Will Affect Its Future."

Senator Greene's letter raises some serious concerns about possible abuse of JPTA that compelled me to bring this issue to our attention.

Senator Greene should be commended for bringing this matter to our attention.

Attached hereto is a copy of the letter in question:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE, SENATE
COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
Sacramento, CA, February 11, 1985.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is to invite your attention to the accompanying presentations of two officials of the National Association of Personnel Consultants, which were printed in the final program of the association's annual conference in Atlanta this past November 1984, relating to the nation's, states' and local entities' process for training citizens for employment in the work force under the still virgin Job Training and Partnership Act.

There is not sufficient evidence at this time to indicate how prevalent this "repeat of history" or "re-run of an old movie" might be; however, identical past actions of this nature earned the description of "poverty pimp."

It can be argued this could be the opening salvo of a new menace to training California citizens and moving them into employment in the work force, which could appropriately be tagged the tactics of "private sector jobs pimps."

On the other side of the coin, a question must reasonably be posed as to what are some of the Private Industry Councils and Service Delivery Areas organizations (training agencies), using as basis for approving training contracts. How much do they look into the nature of their contracts? How much do they look into the reasonable cost of the service for which they contract? How

much do they examine the outcome to be expected from such services?

It is clear from the accompanying presentations of these NAPC officials we would be amazed to see what JTPA contracts pay \$100,000 for; especially in California, which receives special billing. And to think, under CETA and earlier training efforts the identical services were available at the cost of a civil service salary, or that of an employee of a government financed, community-based organization.

I urge you to join in assuring this type of business is not permitted to take hold in California under JTPA.

Respectfully,

BILL GREENE,
Chairman.●

TEENAGE DRUG ABUSE: RECENT NATIONAL TRENDS

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse is a poison that threatens the well-being of thousands of our Nation's young people. As the original chairman of the House Task Force on International Narcotics Control, I worked to stem the flow of drugs across our borders. But the struggle against drugs is a war with many fronts. The war at home—in our high schools and junior highs, on the streets of our towns and cities and in our families—is just as critical, if not more so, than the interdiction efforts taking place at or outside our borders. The targets of our international struggle against drugs—producers, traffickers, smugglers—are often difficult to identify and locate. But the principal object of our domestic war against drugs can be an even more elusive entity: the minds of our young people.

In order to give us a clearer picture of the attitudes and habits of teenagers regarding drugs, the National Institute on Drug Abuse each year conducts a survey of high school seniors. The results of the latest survey, based on the responses of 16,000 members of the class of 1984, offer us reason for guarded hope that we are beginning to make progress in this arduous fight, but also for concern about the growing strength of an emerging enemy.

Rates of use of marijuana, sedatives, stimulants, alcohol, and cigarettes all declined in 1984; 25.2 percent of the seniors interviewed reported having used marijuana at least once in the previous 30 days, compared to 27 percent last year and more than 37 percent just 6 years ago. The rate of use of stimulants dropped from 10.7 percent 2 years ago to 8.3 percent. Sedative use, at 2.3 percent, was less than half the level for 1980. Two-thirds of the seniors interviewed reported having used alcohol during the previous month, but that figure actually

represented a decline of about 5 percent from the 1978 high of more than 72 percent. Cigarette use dropped below the 30 percent mark for the first time since the survey was started, down significantly from the 1976 rate of 38.8 percent.

These figures for current use were bolstered by the results for rates of daily use. At 5 percent, the level of daily use of marijuana was less than half the rate reported in 1978; 4.8 percent of the seniors reported using alcohol daily, compared to 6.9 percent in 1979. Daily cigarette use fell from 21.2 percent last year to 18.7 percent, a level more than 10 percent below the levels of 6 and 7 years ago.

Overall, the rate of current use of illicit drugs among seniors dropped to 29 percent in 1984, down from 33 percent in 1983 and 39 percent in 1978 and 1979.

In addition to revealing changes in behavior, the survey demonstrated encouraging trends in teenagers' attitudes toward drug use. Asked whether there was "great risk" involved in taking cocaine, smoking marijuana, smoking cigarettes, and drinking alcohol, the percentage of seniors responding positively rose for each type of drug use; 78 percent of those interviewed considered regular cocaine use dangerous, an increase of 5 percent. Two-thirds of the seniors regarded regular marijuana use to be risky. The percentage recognizing the dangers of cigarette smoking was just slightly below that for marijuana, and the percentage expressing concern about heavy drinking was up 5 percent from last year to 42 percent.

While many of these trends in drug use and attitude toward drug use are encouraging, the absolute levels of these types of behavior and attitude remain distressingly high. In addition, at least two drugs, cocaine and PCP—phencyclidine—show no decline, and perhaps a slight increase, in popularity. The level of current use of PCP, though still below the high of 2.4 percent recorded in 1979, rose for the second year in a row to 1.6 percent. The rate of regular cocaine use jumped even more dramatically, from 4.9 percent to 5.8 percent. While the cocaine use figure was comparable to the level 5 years ago, it remained substantially higher than the levels found during the late 1970's.

If we are to maintain some of the momentum we seem to have gained in the fight against drugs over the last several years, we must increase our commitment to that fight—a commitment expressed not merely in amounts of taxpayers' money spent on drug abuse prevention, but a commitment expressed in time and effort and creativity contributed by educators and parents and legislators and young peers. A commitment expressed in the

examples we set and the lessons we share.

The fight against drugs is a fight we can win. But we must renew the struggle through a process of collective education and inspiration.●

THOUGHTS ON THE MX AND DEFENSE SPENDING

HON. JOHN MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, with our national economy and security faced by both \$200 billion a year deficits and a Soviet military threat, we must draw carefully the line between wise and unwise defense spending.

THE MX IS NOT SMART DEFENSE SPENDING

I believe the \$40 billion MX Program is not smart defense spending because it offers little deterrence for lots of bucks. The U.S. nuclear weapons strategy is properly built around deterrence. We have designed and are designing nuclear weapons that can survive a Soviet attack and hit the Soviets so hard that they will not dare to launch a nuclear attack. Our Trident submarines, our airborne bombers, our mobile Midgetman missile program satisfy this requirement. The MX does not.

The MX, while powerful, is very vulnerable. Most, if not all, MX's would be wiped out in their stationary silos by a Soviet attack. The original MX plan was to design an invulnerable missile—one that moved around by rail and could not be targeted. But what was planned to be mobile and invulnerable has ended up stationary and very vulnerable. The MX thus has little value as a defensive weapon.

While few MX's, if any, can survive a Soviet attack, they can be used to launch a nuclear attack. The MX therefore is primarily a first strike weapon rather than a second strike weapon. Hence the MX not only does not deter the Soviets but tempts them to strike first.

THE MX IS NOT A BARGAINING CHIP

For the MX to be a credible bargaining chip, the Soviets must believe we will use it. And since the MX is so vulnerable, the Soviets must believe we will use it to strike first, that is, start a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union. I don't believe the United States will start a nuclear attack on the Soviet Union, I don't think many Americans believe this, and I don't think the Soviet Union believes this. There are nations in this world, including the Soviet Union, who may start an all out

nuclear war, but the United States is not one of them.

Even if the MX is a bargaining chip, logic dictates not that we build it, but that we continue to threaten to do so. Last summer Congress said it would make no decision on MX until this spring, in order to see if the Soviets would come back to the negotiating table. They have. If MX really is a bargaining chip, Congress should say it will make no decision on MX until it sees what the Soviets offer at the negotiating table. Threatening to build a weapon may be a bargaining chip. But I believe once the money is spent and the weapon is built, it is an accomplished fact—not a bargaining chip.

THE MX SHOULD NOT BE BUILT JUST BECAUSE OF THE GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS

During the last campaign I opposed the MX. One factor has changed since then: negotiations at Geneva.

I believe all Americans want the negotiations to succeed. Consistent with U.S. security, we must strive for arms stability and reductions. I don't believe, however, that it makes any more sense to approve the MX just because we are in negotiations, than it would make sense to reject the MX if tomorrow the Soviets walk out of the negotiations. We are now in negotiations that may last 2, 3, or 5 years. And that's just this round. We may well be in arms negotiations with the Soviets for 14 of the next 30 years. During that time we will have to make scores and scores of defense spending decisions. I don't believe we can approve every Pentagon spending request because we are in or out of negotiations. I believe we must base our decisions on whether it is smart defense spending. And smart defense spending the MX is not. ●

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE OCEAN DUMPING ACT

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the ocean dumping of more than 8 million tons of sewage sludge each year just off the coast of New York and New Jersey has created considerable controversy in the mid-Atlantic region. Sludge dumping at the 12-mile site has continued to degrade the area's water since 1924. The New York Bight Apex has become one of this country's most seriously degraded coastal areas.

I am today introducing legislation to close the 12-mile site and to address the serious problems associated with the ocean dumping of municipal wastes. I am pleased to have the support of a number of members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Committee, including Congressman NORMAN LENT, the committee's ranking minority member. I am also pleased that Congressman JAMES HOWARD, chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, has joined in cosponsoring this legislation.

The legislation is similar to a proposal I developed with the late Congressman Forsythe during the 98th Congress. Most of its provisions were included in H.R. 4829, which passed the House of Representatives last October. The legislation is the result of several years of work by members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the New Jersey delegation who have been concerned over the impact of ocean dumping on the region's coastal waters and marine resources.

In addition to closing the 12-mile sludge dumpsite within 18 months after the date of enactment, the bill requires the Environmental Protection Agency to develop a comprehensive plan to improve the coastal water quality in the New York Bight Apex. The plan is designed to address the broad range of pollutant inputs to the area, including the disposal of dredged materials and industrial wastes, the discharge of untreated wastes, and urban and agricultural runoff.

The legislation is also designed to assure better coordination between State and Federal environmental programs. The bill requires that municipalities which ocean dump after December 31, 1986, be in compliance with the Clean Water Act's pretreatment requirements. The bill also requires EPA to consult with the States to determine whether appropriate land-based alternatives are available.

The bill includes several important provisions authored by Congressman CARPER which were included in the ocean dumping reauthorization legislation in the 98th Congress. The first of these would allow the EPA to recover costs associated with activities directly associated with the issuance of permits, including site designation, monitoring, and enforcement activities. The second provision requires the Agency to end the ocean dumping of all harmful municipal sludge within 18 months after the date of enactment. Harmful municipal sludges are defined as those which fail EPA's environmental impact criteria under the Agency's ocean dumping regulations.

In reintroducing this legislation, I have also included a new provision designed to assure that the ocean dumping of sewage sludge does not become a long-term disposal alternative after dumping is moved from the 12-mile site to a deeper water location. The bill provides for the assessment of a special disposal fee on sludge dumped in the oceans. Money from the fees would be made available to the mu-

nicipalities and EPA to develop suitable land-based alternatives to ocean dumping including resource recovery, recycling, incineration, and composting projects.

The 12-mile site must be closed before we can begin the task of cleaning up the coastal waters in the New York Bight apex. Almost 8 years ago Congress overwhelmingly approved legislation which I sponsored to end the ocean dumping of harmful sewage sludge by December 31, 1981. Although we are nearly 4 years past that deadline, a handful of municipalities dumped 8.3 million tons of sludge last year alone. That's almost double the amount that was ocean dumped when the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act was signed into law in 1972.

There is no doubt that the New York Bight apex is one of our most severely degraded coastal areas. The ocean dumping of sewage sludge and dredge material along with the discharge of 220 million gallons of raw sewage every day into the Hudson and East Rivers has caused serious water pollution problems. Runoff from agricultural and urban areas, storm sewer overflows, and industrial waste from outfalls up and down the Hudson River and the Raritan Estuary also contribute to the problem.

The cumulative effects of waste disposal in the New York Bight apex has resulted in elevated levels of bacteria, viruses, pathogens, toxic metals, and organohalogenes in the water column and sediments around the 12-mile site. A large portion of the area has been closed to fishing and shellfishing due to severe pollution problems. Commercial and recreational fishery resources in adjacent waters have also been seriously impacted, causing economic harm to the region's multimillion dollar fishing industry. New Jersey officials have repeatedly expressed concern over the high levels of PCB's that have been found in several species of fish taken from coastal and estuarine waters in the area, including popular commercial and recreational species such as striped bass and bluefish.

There is little doubt that the New York Bight apex has reached its capacity to assimilate this waste material. A number of diseases and developmental abnormalities are found in fish and shellfish in the region. Public concern over the extent of degradation in the area is high. Scientists have reported indications of serious sublethal effects, including bioaccumulation and changes in community structure. Sewage material has spread beyond the boundaries of the dumpsite and is found several miles from the shoreline in certain areas.

I am pleased to note that the Environmental Protection Agency today announced its plans to close the 12-

mile dumpsite. It is not clear, however, whether the Agency's actions will be challenged in court by those municipalities who want to continue to use the site as a cheap disposal alternative. This legislation will preclude long and drawn out litigation over the use of the 12-mile site and will assure that ocean dumping in the New York Bight apex is phased out in a reasonable period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Bight apex is our country's last great dumping ground. It is one of the most degraded coastal areas in the country. To my mind, this alone is cause for alarm. I am hopeful that we can address this problem before it is too late. Thank you. ●

CREEPING CAPITALISM

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about some of the progress we have made in the area of defense procurement reform, and give a pitch for legislation I am sponsoring, dubbed the "creeping capitalism" bill.

The House Armed Services Committee successfully led the last Congress in passing important procurement reform legislation that is improving the way the Pentagon does business. I commend Representatives DICKINSON and PRICE in particular for shepherding through the House the most extensive and constructive changes in procurement law in recent memory.

We all recognize the major problem we face: The eroding consensus for a strong defense due to the horror stories spanning from the revelations about \$7,000 coffee machines and \$600 toilet seats to the entertainment expenses and cost overruns of General Dynamics to the quality control problems that pervade all sectors of the defense industry.

Some believe that the way to impose discipline on the Pentagon and gain greater efficiency is to arbitrarily cut the defense budget.

The members of the Subcommittee on Procurement and Military Nuclear Systems understand that blindly slashing the budget is no solution. Focusing solely on input to solve procurement abuses is wrong—and an abdication of responsibility. To be constructive, changes in structure and process must be proposed—in Congress as well as at the Pentagon—that would improve the way the Pentagon buys its weapons.

We have had some successes in proposing and passing constructive responses to the problems that exist. We had Representatives PRICE and DICKINSON's Defense Procurement Reform

Act (H.R. 5167) from last year that enhanced competition and improved acquisition planning. The military reform caucus was also instrumental in supporting successful, constructive legislation that created an independent office of operational testing and evaluation in the Pentagon—ensuring objective, impartial operational testing of our weapons—and a flexible law requiring warranties from the manufacturers of our weapons. I am happy to report that the Pentagon is now successfully implementing these laws. Another clear sign of the success of these measures was that both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms endorsed these reforms.

The revised creeping capitalism bill (H.R. 1552) builds upon and endorses the procurement reform legislation sponsored by my colleagues Representatives PRICE and DICKINSON last year. It is a moderate, realistic approach to increasing competition in Pentagon procurement, using the definitions of competition contained in the new laws. Creeping capitalism's main thrust is to increase the percentage of competitive contracts by 5 percent per year until 70 percent is reached.

The Pentagon objected to last year's version of creeping capitalism because the feeling was that the conception of competition was somewhat rigid, not recognizing the competition that is sometimes involved in contracts that are negotiated between the Pentagon and several contractors. The new statutes blur the distinction between competition by formal advertising and competitive negotiation, and now focus on the real issue of defense contracts: Whether all potential offerers were given a real opportunity to compete.

The revised creeping capitalism bill endorses the new definition by requiring the Pentagon to ensure that an increasing percentage of contracts follow these competitive procedures. In short, H.R. 1552 builds upon the work done by this committee to expand competition.

As the House Armed Services Committee recognizes, the benefits of a competitive approach to contract awards are numerous. Competition will, above all, reduce costs and add to the value of each defense dollar we spend. Competition, when put into practice, has spawned some of the most creative and innovative achievements of our Nation's defense industry. For the United States, which depends on technological superiority to maintain the military balance with the Soviets, the creative pressure fostered by the competitive process is a great asset.

The advantages of competition are numerous:

Competition can reduce unit prices.

It can increase the size of the defense industrial base by bringing new companies into competition for the Pentagon's procurement dollar.

Companies under competitive pressures are more innovative and cost conscious than those that are given the safe monopoly of a sole source contract.

Creeping capitalism also encourages multiyear procurements and dual-sourcing—we have witnessed the enormous benefits of dual-sourcing in particular recently. The Pentagon should be applauded for these efforts.

A good example of the benefits of splitting contracts is what has become known as "the great engine war" over the Air Force's purchase of engines for its fighter aircraft. Bids are resubmitted each year by the two competitors, and the low bidder gets the lion's share of the contract. Initial Air Force estimates of savings due to this dual sourcing between Pratt-Whitney and General Electric were \$2 to \$3 billion. The Air Force, 1 year later, now has doubled this estimate, upping the amount saved by taxpayers to \$5 billion the lesson: Free enterprise works in slashing costs, and sometimes even better than expected.

Another example of the value of dual-sourcing comes from a company in my home State of New Jersey. The Navy's Aegis cruisers—the most complex weapon system in the world today—is a model for enlightened competition. It has progressed through the full sequence of competition reforms that we have been advocating—from prime contractor competition, to fixed price contracts, to breakout, and now to second sourcing of the components. The Navy has approved a plan to have RCA—the prime contractor—qualify second sources, and when they have finished, 90 percent of the Aegis will be completed. These are just several of many such examples.

Creeping capitalism supports these positive efforts that both the Pentagon and Congress have made to expand competition. H.R. 1552 takes a moderate, realistic approach to the problem of competition in defense procurement. It will help bring down costs, and rebuild the consensus for a strong defense. It is a constructive, bipartisan effort, and I urge the Members of this body to give it their strong support.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions. ●

NEW YORK BIGHT APEX
RESTORATION

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Lee Thomas, announced today that he is denying the request for a redesignation of the so-called "12-Mile Site" used for municipal sewage sludge dumping in the New York Bight. Administrator Thomas plans to enter into negotiations with those municipalities which are now dumping sewage sludge into the New York Bight, to achieve a rapid phase-out of their activities at that site.

I applaud Administrator Thomas' actions. However, I am concerned that implementation of these decisions may be subject to lengthy delays due either to litigation or protracted negotiations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Honorable WILLIAM J. HUGHES, and others, in the introduction of amendments to the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, which will reinforce Administrator Thomas' decision to close the 12-mile site, and provide additional measures to address the severe problems of pollution in the New York Bight. This legislation is very similar to legislation introduced in the 98th Congress by Congressman HUGHES, and the late Congressman Edwin B. Forsythe, my former colleague on the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I also was a cosponsor of that legislation, which passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming margin in October of last year.

The New York Bight apex is a 1,100-square-nautical-mile area of the Atlantic Ocean adjacent to the entrance of New York Harbor and bordered on the north by Long Island, and on the west by New Jersey. The apex is recognized as one of the most heavily contaminated coastal areas of the United States due to multiple sources, including municipal and industrial waste water discharges, combined sewer overflows, ocean dumping, and urban and rural nonpoint source runoff. The land adjacent to the New York Bight apex contains not only New York City, but the heavily populated urban centers of western Long Island and northern New Jersey. This area serves as a major center of commercial and recreational activity. In addition to providing a major path of access for international trade, the waters of the New York Bight support an important fisheries industry and provide a focal point for some of our Nation's most beautiful and widely used beaches. Among these beaches are Jones Beach and the Robert Moses State Park on

the south shore of Long Island; this is one of the most heavily used recreational beach areas in the United States.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has held numerous hearings over the past 13 years since the passage of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, to address the specific problems of contamination at the existing municipal sludge dumpsite in the New York Bight apex (commonly known as the "12-Mile Site"). Federal officials from the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] have confirmed that the 12-mile site is heavily contaminated and that a deepwater dumpsite would provide a number of important advantages:

First, the "12-Mile Site" is located in the heavily trafficked entrance to New York Harbor. Maritime interests have expressed serious concern over potential hazards to navigation resulting from dumping activities in these busy traffic lanes. A deepwater dumpsite could be located away from major shipping lanes.

Second, valuable living marine resources are associated with the "12-Mile Site" and nearby areas. These resources are used by commercial and recreational fishing industries and the public. Living marine resources associated with a deepwater dumpsite are reported by NOAA to be far less valuable.

Third, the currents, depth, and other water conditions at the "12-Mile Site" result in less dispersion than at sites located further offshore, resulting in elevated levels of bacteria and viruses in the water column and bottom sediments, and increases in normal ambient levels of toxic metals and organohalogenes in the bottom sediments. Changes in relative abundance and diversity of species in areas affected by the existing sludge discharges have been observed. The much greater depth of a deepwater dumpsite would provide for greater dispersion and dilution of the wastes, and present low probabilities of any permanent harm to marine resources, including bottom organisms.

Fourth, the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act expresses a preference for sites located off of the Continental Shelf where feasible.

Fifth, the "12-Mile Site" is located considerably closer to coastal beaches and resorts of Long Island and New Jersey. Concern for potential impact exists because identifiable waste constituents have been observed at above normal levels in bottom sediments within five nautical miles of the Long Island coastline. Available technical information indicates that no waste would be transported from a deepwater dumpsite to impact upon the coastal beaches of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, or Virginia.

The cumulative effects of current and previous discharges and dumping in the New York Bight apex have resulted in increased occurrences of fish and shellfish disease, decreases in catches of fish, and increases in the prevalence of phytoplankton blooms, periods of depressed oxygen, levels, and fish and shellfish kills. Similar cumulative impacts would not be expected at a deepwater dumpsite.

EPA witnesses also indicated that, had the 12-mile site not been historically used for ocean disposal, it probably would never have been designated as an ocean disposal site based on the criteria in the Ocean Dumping Act.

The bill which we introduced today takes a number of steps in addressing the problems of the New York Bight apex.

First, we have included several general provisions which will improve the operation of EPA's Ocean Dumping Permit Program.

Anyone wishing to use the ocean to dispose of municipal sludge after December 31, 1986, will be required to be in compliance with the Clean Water Act regarding effective and comprehensive pretreatment programs for industrial waste discharged into the municipal waste treatment facility. The Administrator of EPA will not be authorized to issue a municipal sludge dumping permit until after he has consulted with the Governor of the State in which the sewage treatment plant is located and has determined that no suitable land-based alternative to the ocean disposal is currently available. This requirement will encourage the States to become more actively involved in the review and development of alternative disposal technologies.

In order to support EPA's Ocean Dumping Program in a fair and equitable manner, the Administrator will be required to collect user fees at levels sufficient to recover the reasonable costs that the Agency will need for the processing activities directly associated with the issuance of the permits, the costs of site designation, the costs of compliance monitoring, surveillance and enforcement, and the assessment of the direct effects of the ocean dumping on the marine environment. We believe that those who use the ocean for disposal of their waste should at least pay for the reasonable costs associated with regulating that activity.

This bill has two major provisions which deal directly with the problems of contamination of the New York Bight apex.

First, municipal sludge dumping in the apex is prohibited 18 months after enactment of the bill, or at the earliest reasonable time, whichever is sooner.

Second, the legislation which we have introduced today requires the Administrator to prepare, within 3 years, a "New York Bight Apex Restoration Plan."

Testimony at our hearings has made it absolutely clear that the problems of the apex cannot be laid entirely at the feet of ocean dumping. While ocean dumping is a significant source of contamination, especially in the areas immediately impacted by ocean activities, it is readily apparent that

the apex cannot be restored to anywhere near its former levels of water and marine resources quality unless the other sources of contaminants are also addressed. Unfortunately, the various sources of pollutants, which end up either directly or indirectly in the apex, are controlled by a number of different environmental statutes, making a coordinated effort to address the overall problem difficult to implement.

The purpose of the New York Bight apex restoration plan will be to:

(a) Identify and assess the impact of all types and sources of pollutants, such as treated and untreated sewage discharges, industrial outfalls, agricultural and urban runoff, storm sewer overflow, upstream contaminant sources, and ocean dumping, that are affecting the water quality and marine resources of the Apex;

(b) Identify those uses in the Apex that are being inhibited because of these pollutants;

(c) Determine the fate of contaminants and their effects on the marine environment;

(d) Identify technologies and management practices, and determine the costs necessary to control these pollutants;

(e) Identify impediments (technical, fiscal, and administrative) to the control of these pollutants;

(f) Devise a schedule of economically feasible projects to implement the controls identified under the plan and to remove the impediments; and

(g) Develop recommendations for funding and coordinating the various Federal, state, and local government programs necessary to implement the projects.

The legislation authorizes \$2 million for each of fiscal year 1986 and 1987, and \$1 million for fiscal year 1988 to accomplish this ambitious planning program.

Mr. Speaker, the Hughes-Lent bill offers a reasonable but ambitious path for this country to take in solving the pollution problems of this highly stressed portion of the Atlantic Ocean's marine environment. The scientific data conclusively support a move of ocean dumping of municipal sludge, out of the 12-mile site to a deepwater dumpsite. A complete and comprehensive review of all alternatives for the disposal of municipal sludge generated in the New York metropolitan region is necessary and long overdue. And finally, I believe that we must make a comprehensive assessment of the causes of the high levels of marine contamination in the New York Bight apex, and develop reasoned solutions which can be efficiently implemented. We can no longer afford to wait before taking action. I urge my colleagues to carefully review the legislation which we have introduced today and to support the passage of these much needed programs. Thank you.●

AMERICA'S VETERANS

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, America's 28 million veterans answered the call to duty and served their nation proudly and well. They have done their part, often during periods of great peril and unimaginable personal danger, to help ensure the freedom and the liberty enjoyed by their fellow Americans and by our democratic allies. Since the end of the Civil War, Americans have recognized the special responsibility that we owe to the men and women who have sacrificed so much for the rest of us. Following the advice of Lincoln, we have made a commitment to "care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphans."

Over half a century ago, Congress created the Veterans' Administration to bring under one roof the various Federal agencies devoted to caring for the special needs of veterans and their dependents. Today, the VA is the largest independent Federal Government agency, administering 172 hospitals nationwide. Its 226 outpatient clinics have over 18 million visits each year. In addition, the VA provides nursing home and specialized care to over 29,000 veterans each year.

Congress has continued to address the pressing needs of many of our veterans. Last year, we passed a variety of landmark legislation in areas ranging from agent orange and post traumatic stress disorder to job training and education bills. The Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act created a program to directly assist employers in training veterans for long-term job opportunities, an especially important need for Vietnam and Korean war veterans whose rate of chronic unemployment is considerably above the national average. Prior to the program's expiration in February, it helped to place over 26,000 veterans in stable, productive jobs.

During the past several years, Congress has taken a responsible look at programs that could be cut back, and savings that could be made in various veterans' programs. I know that Chairman MONTGOMERY and other members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee have made every effort to cut costs where they were excessive. Indeed, the committee has saved more than \$1 billion during the last 4 years by terminating certain benefits and services. At the same time, however, they have taken the lead in fighting efforts to gut our national commitment to the American veteran. Their leadership enabled Congress to defeat the administration's misguided efforts to balance the Federal budget on the backs of our

veterans. We were able to turn down a \$390 million cut in the VA medical budget; the elimination of 1,800 hospital beds; a 17-percent cut in staffing for vocational rehabilitation; and a cruel proposal to cut \$234 million in needed veterans programs—70 percent of which were to come from veterans suffering disability from service related injuries.

Now, the administration is again proposing drastic cuts that will dangerously alter America's ability to meet its obligations to our veterans. At a time when World War II veterans are reaching age 65 in greater and greater numbers—7.2 million veterans will be 65 or older within 4 years—the President is calling for sharp reductions in VA services and a slowdown in the construction of needed hospital projects. In addition, he would raise the eligibility rates for many services, cut salaries, and drastically reduce the staffing needed to effectively run current programs.

Chairman MONTGOMERY has described what these proposals foretell:

Shutting down the VA Home Loan Guaranty Program; encouraging the most highly motivated and qualified of the VA's employees to seek employment outside of Government; shifting health care costs to an already heavily taxed Medicare system or, worse yet, denying health care altogether to individuals who served in the Armed Forces; and consolidating most of the functions of our 58 VA regional offices to 3 centralized locations.

These alternatives are simply unacceptable. Congress must ensure that our veterans are treated equitably as efforts are made to reduce spending and bring the budget into balance. I believe we need to immediately enact an across-the-board freeze on all spending, and then proceed on a pay-as-you-go basis for each spending proposal. Rather than cutting into important and vital programs that meet our veterans health, education, and living needs, Congress must fashion reasonable proposals that require shared sacrifices from every element of American society.

Thomas Jefferson said, "Whensoever hostile aggressions *** require a resort to war, we must meet our duty and convince the world that we are just friends and brave enemies." In peacetime and during war, with courage and determination, America's veterans have done just that. They have made their contribution to America and its progress. Now, as we face the challenge of reducing the massive deficit we have a responsibility to ensure that our veterans are not required to carry a greater burden than any other group in our country. Congress should reject the administration proposals and protect the real needs of our veterans.●

WAITING FOR THE OLDER STUDENT

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in the next few months the Congress will be undertaking the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act in order to update the law in accordance with current trends in higher education and to prepare the Federal role in higher education for the changes of the 1990's. One trend which is quite apparent already is the shift of our college population toward the older student. Already, studies indicate that adult learners may comprise nearly 50 percent of our student body by 1991. They are nontraditional students who are attending college for the first time, or they are adults who are returning to higher education to seek further training, retraining, or skill improvement.

Yet our current law, and to a certain extent our colleges and universities, has not come to grips with these trends. Already this session I have introduced legislation which would revise title I of the HEA to focus that portion of the act on institutional development and change to serve the adult learner. In addition, we must also examine our student aid programs to ensure that they serve the older student fairly.

In this regard, I would like to share with my colleagues an article by William F. Brazziel which was recently published in the American Association of Higher Education Bulletin. William Brazziel is professor of higher education and coordinator of higher education programs at the University of Connecticut. His article, "Waiting for the Older Student," pointedly presents some of the changes both our law and educational institutions must undertake to properly and successfully serve the nontraditional student:

[From the American Association of Higher Education Bulletin, February 1985]

WAITING FOR THE OLDER STUDENT (By William F. Brazziel)

The president finally called Ratchley in to talk about the problem. The older student strategy simply was not working. Lord knows, there were plenty of older students on campus; you could see them everywhere. But earlier promises that their numbers would make up for shortfalls in the enrollment of younger students were dimming in the face of discouraging reports on FTE enrollment and tuition revenues.

Ratchley had come aboard two years ago to head the new lifelong learning program. He came highly recommended; the search committee had marveled at his interview presence. What had gone wrong? It was best to have it out now.

Ratchley, for his part, was braced for the moment. He could count as well as the next person. Although the programs he initiated

had brought in many older students, he knew that, all-in-all, it was not enough. For the past several months he had found himself mentally retooling his resume. But he'd go into this meeting with some concrete suggestions for the president; if accepted, they could boost the older student strategy into orbit. If not, then goodbye Crystal Lake and hello Allentown Tech, or wherever. It was best to have this out now.

After inquiring into the health of the family and expressing gratitude at being able to slow two busy schedules enough to interface, the president quickly got down to brass tacks. He commanded Ratchley to talk to him about the failing strategy.

Ratchley was just as brisk. He began with a recitation of the new programs he had been able to get department heads to start: a business program for women who wanted to return to the workforce. A bachelor of general studies program for students who left college early and now wanted to finish, a Learn-Over-Lunch program for business people in the downtown area, plus a dozen or so similar efforts. He then recited chapter and verse of the rises in enrollment of older students on campus, keeping his statistics short and simple. (The president was a history major and often raised his voice at overdrawn statistical presentations.)

Before the president could get a "so what" look on his face, Ratchley wheeled into his analysis of the crux of the problem. "We are waiting for the older student, Mr. President," Ratchley intoned, "but we can't seem to get ready for them." Pausing to let the president ponder over this profundity, Ratchley produced a chart showing that while older students now accounted for fully a third of the headcount at Crystal Lake, they accounted for only about ten percent of the credit hours generated.

The president assimilated the charted statistics slowly; Ratchley gave him time. At the appropriate moment, Ratchley continued gently: "So, you see Mr. President, to really get ready for the older student, we must conceptualize differently and this is a point you will have to help me get across to everybody on campus. We must have more older students, although we now have many, and we must somehow get them to take more courses." Ratchley brought closure as skillfully as his instructor had done in demonstrations in his graduate course in adult education. He cited the latest national figures showing that younger students enrolled for about eight courses a year, while older students only signed up for two. He pointed out that for a shortfall of one full-time student, Crystal Lake would have to enroll four older students. He also pointed out that increasing the number of courses older students took would lower the number of older students needed to make up the shortfall. If older students were taking four courses a year at Crystal Lake, for example, we would only require the enrollment of two older students to make up for a shortfall of one regular student.

PROJECTED NUMBER OF ADULT STUDENTS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	Age			Total
	25-29	30-34	35 and over	
1980.....	1,974,500	1,058,280	750,000	3,782,780
1984.....	2,117,700	1,151,700	844,131	4,113,531
1988.....	2,108,902	1,257,420	950,075	4,316,397
1994.....	1,796,000	1,249,000	1,134,443	4,179,443
1999.....	1,724,100	1,108,900	1,276,823	4,109,823

"More older students taking more courses," the president said to no one in particular as he gazed out the window. Ratchley had made his point.

The prexy swung around in his chair and asked Ratchley if he had thought about how to bring about such a scenario. Ratchley had come prepared. Daycare centers and plastic money should be put in place at once, he said, noting that all of their evaluation studies had shown that women wanted to be able to leave their children at daycare centers on the campus, and that if daycare was available, they would increase their course loads. Both men and women had noted that they had read or heard about colleges where credit cards could be used to pay for registration and wondered why Crystal Lake had yet to "go plastic."

Striking while the iron was hot, Ratchley moved on to the desirability of registration by telephone, wondering to himself what the registrar's reaction would be. He produced some brochures from other colleges to illustrate the option and quickly moved on to the prospects of developing an adult career development center. He noted that large numbers of adults attend college to re-enter the workforce, upgrade themselves in their jobs, change careers, and the like, and that career development centers got to the core of their concerns directly, and thereby helped generate enrollments and credit hours.

Ratchley leaned forward for emphasis and told the president that a single most important strategy in the drive would be to convince department heads and faculty members to offer older students the courses they wanted instead of courses that department heads and faculty felt they needed. This was vitally important, Ratchley said, in planning non-credit and non-degree offerings. Cloning regular offerings for evening and satellite schedules simply would not do. He noted that he was having difficulty convincing academic units to find out what older students wanted to study; some of them had told him that the low-level market research his department had mounted had no place in an academic institution. Fast food corporations, perhaps, but not in academe.

The president took Ratchley's side in this matter. He noted that while he had four degrees in history, an honorary degree, and had studied at the Sorbonne, he could see the logic in at least attempting to find out what adults wanted in the way of course offerings and in shaping offerings within reason to meet these needs.

The president rose, shook Ratchley's hand and led him to the door. He placed a hand on Ratchley's shoulder and said he felt they had a handle on the problem and could work it out. "More older students enrolling for more courses," he said, as he guided Ratchley out the door. And as the door closed, Ratchley could hear, ever so slightly, "plastic money," "telephone registration," "daycare," "wants not needs," "career development" . . .

Ratchley took Mrs. Ratchley and the little Ratchleys out to dinner that evening and, while lining up for the salad bar, he suggested to Mrs. Ratchley that it might be a good time to go ahead with plans for new drapes in the living room. Maybe a new carpeting job, too. If things worked out. ●

April 1, 1985

FOR THE RELIEF OF O. EDMUND CLUBB

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill for the relief of O. Edmund Clubb. Mr. Clubb had a distinguished career from 1928 until his retirement in 1952 as a U.S. Foreign Service officer. He spent 18 years of service in China, and from 1947 to 1950 he served as U.S. Counsel General in Peiping (Peking), China. After Mr. Clubb left China in 1950, his personal possessions consisting of valuable objects of art and rare manuscripts were removed and detained by local Chinese authorities and became unaccounted for in the departure. Since 1950, Mr. Clubb has pursued every possible administrative remedy for the recovery of his possessions without success. A private bill is now his only recourse.

I think it is appropriate when considering this claim to recognize the course of events that forced Mr. Clubb and his colleagues from Government service in 1952. Although he is now recognized as a respected scholar of Chinese political and social history, he and his contemporaries in the Foreign Service were blamed for the "loss of China" during the McCarthy era. In fact they became the scapegoats for a failure of policy that he sought to prevent. For many years, Mr. Clubb suffered losses far beyond what this bill would restore to him.

As to Mr. Clubb's actual losses, there is no dispute. The U.S. State Department has provided documents attesting to the items claimed and the circumstances of the loss. The State Department has suggested a private bill to make restitution to Mr. Clubb for property that is basically irreplaceable.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT E. WISE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present and voting for rollcall No. 35, final passage of House Resolution 100, to authorize funding for House committees, fiscal year 1986, which occurred on Tuesday morning, March 26. Unfortunately, the flight that I usually catch from my district back to Washington was fogged in at Charleston, WV, and I could not arrive in time to cast my vote. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "nay."●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE STEEL-JAW LEHOLD TRAP:
AN INHUMANE DEVICE

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with much concern that I call to the attention of my colleagues one of the most inhumane trapping techniques practiced against animals—the steel-jaw leghold trap.

This device, although simple in design, is extremely hazardous for any animal that trips its powerful jaws. Since the trap rarely kills, the animal is crippled, and remains caught for an average of 15 hours before the trapper makes his rounds. There are endless stories about the horrors faced by the innocent creatures caught in the grasp of these traps. They are left unable to defend themselves against predatory animals; in desperation, they often gnaw off their own trapped limbs to gain freedom. All too frequently, they die in agony before the trapper returns.

Mr. Speaker, the steel-jaw leghold is indiscriminate. The trap will close upon any fauna that strays across it. Three nontarget animals—such as dogs, cats, and birds—are caught and killed for every fur bearing animal snared by a trapper. These nontargets are considered to be trash, and are commonly thrown aside before the trapper resets for another catch.

Because of the cruelty of the steel-jaw leghold trap, I would like to encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting legislation, H.R. 1809, which would ban the use of this instrument. Over 60 nations and several States have already acknowledged the inhumane nature of the trap, and have acted to limit or outlaw its use. Mr. Speaker, I recommend that we follow their example and end the brutality of the steel-jaw leghold trap.●

SANTA CLARA COUNTY SIXTH
ANNUAL CHILD ABUSE SYMPOSIUM
COINCIDES WITH CHILD
ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, children are our most precious resource, and, appropriately, April has been proclaimed "Child Abuse Prevention Month" by the Congress in recognition of this serious problem.

In Santa Clara County, CA, there were 9,151 referrals and reports of child abuse and neglect in 1984 alone. These incidents included nonacciden-

tial physical injury, sexual assault, willful cruelty, unjustifiable punishment, and negligent treatment of children.

As many of my colleagues know, abused children are prone to developmental and educational disabilities, and at adolescence are more likely to drop out of school, become substance abusers or runaways, suicidal or engage in violent, or antisocial behavior.

Fortunately, Santa Clara County has implemented effective prevention and intervention programs to help children and their parents to lead healthier family lives. Dedicated professionals in social work, probation, public health, and law enforcement, together with volunteer groups and private agencies, have devoted many hours of personal time to develop training programs that make child abuse prevention and treatment available in the community at a minimum cost.

This year, the county is holding its Sixth Annual Child Abuse Symposium April 11-12. The symposium attracts close to 300 professionals and volunteers from throughout the San Francisco Bay area and provides participants with a new perspective on the prevention and treatment of child abuse.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the organizers of the Sixth Annual Child Abuse Symposium. They are: Dave Bartholomew, Bob Carroll, Terri Locke-Carroll, Barbara Davis, Lynn Fossum, Martha Frank, Hortencia Garces, Bruce Hult, Marv Lewis, Bob Masterson, Lorrie Moore, and Evelyn Schreck.

These fine individuals are to be commended for their deep concern and unselfish dedication to the cause of preventing child abuse. It is truly an honor to bring their accomplishments to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.●

A TRIBUTE TO PASCUA FLORIDA
WEEK

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I proudly rise today to pay tribute to Pascua Florida Week, an annual observance from March 27 through April 2 of the State of Florida's long and colorful heritage. At Easter, 472 years ago, three Spanish caravels sailed up the coast of Florida and anchored in 8 fathoms of water. Awed by the lush greenery and gay spring blossoms, the commander knelt down on the ground once ashore and gave his discovery a name—"Pascua Florida," meaning a feast of flowers at Easter time. That

commander was Ponce de Leon. He planted a red and gold banner claiming the turf for Ferdinand V, though it would be only the first of five flags to eventually fly over the beautiful territory.

Thanks to the persistent efforts of journalist and historian Cherie Gardner of Daytona Beach, Pascua Florida Week has been since 1977 a time when we Floridians pause to reflect upon and commemorate our great State's history, traditions, and role in the growth and development of this country. The editor of *Reflections*, a magazine dedicated to keeping Florida's history alive, Mrs. Gardner has obtained proclamations from the Governor; the mayors of Daytona Beach, New Smyrna Beach, Ormond Beach, Port Orange, and others that declare this Pascua Florida Week.

Cherie Gardner is to be commended for arranging this opportunity for us to celebrate our rich and diverse history as a State. ●

CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, as we continue our often heated debates about economic policy, I would like to suggest that we step back for a moment to recall the moral underpinnings of our arguments.

Last November, we received a moral challenge from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. In their pastoral letter, "Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy," the bishops examined the state of our economy and found it wanting. I call upon my colleagues to take note of the observations of the bishops. Their letter is a strong reminder that the glow of health of our economy glosses over deep pockets of poverty, unemployment, and social alienation.

In the midst of a recovery from our worst recession in years, the poverty level is at 15 percent, the highest level in 20 years. Thus, approximately one out of every seven people is excluded from our American birthright of justice and equal opportunity. When faced with the gritty task of daily survival, what is the meaning of "opportunity" if the opportunity to escape such a condition is not available? How many families, communities, and sad solitary lives will be devastated by the awful reality of poverty in America and in the world before we recognize the moral obligation that should serve as the foundation of our economic policy? The current recovery is a rising tide that only lifts some boats, leaving the rest to sink or float adrift as best

they can. The bishops recognize that selectivity in an economic recovery should not be condoned; our continued toleration of this condition signifies both a poor understanding of economics and a pitiful sense of morality.

We have set another record with this "recovery": Unemployment is at a historically high level of 7.3 percent—as compared with previous recoveries. But like all statistics, this number can be misleading. Sectors of our society are suffering from inexcusably high unemployment; just last month, the unemployment level of blacks rose from 14.9 to 16.3 percent. How much longer can we allow such inequity?

The unevenness of the recovery is also demonstrated by the effects on our industrial sectors. Aggregate unemployment did fall last month from 7.4 to 7.3 percent, and 119,000 new jobs were created. However, those jobs were the result of an increase of 255,000 jobs in the service sector, less a decrease of 75,000 in the manufacturing sector. It is time to address the structural problems indicated by these numbers; the mounting seriousness of the changes in our economy demands a response. The "pastoral letter" makes the simple request that our response show an awareness that each number in our statistics is a person with needs, rights, and dignity.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, which I chair, held a hearing during which two Nobel laureates in economics, as well as other prominent economists, testified on the feasibility of the bishops' recommendations for a moral economic policy. Nobel laureates James Tobin of Yale and Lawrence Klein of the University of Pennsylvania strongly endorsed the economic policy recommendations of the bishops' letter, arguing that it is well within our ability to lower substantially the levels of poverty and unemployment in our economy without increasing inflation.

The bishops know that beneath every good parable lies a grain of truth. Yet many of us with the power and obligation to help persist in deluding ourselves with false tales of growth and prosperity. Let us now meet the challenge of the bishops with concrete actions to alleviate the severe economic hardship endured by many of our fellow citizens. ●

JUNIOR DAVID MARTIN RETIRE AS CHIEF

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the California Highway Patrol is one of the most respected law enforcement organiza-

tions in the United States today. Without the dedication, talent, and commitment of the very special men and women who are part of the CHP, the citizens of California could not enjoy the safety and peace of mind that they do on and around their highways. The California Highway Patrol is an efficient organization, able and willing to work hard to protect the citizens, and to promote law and order. Each individual in the organization is a vital link in an extremely vital chain. When one of those links is broken, the effects are felt within the CHP as well as within the community. Such a link is about to be broken.

This year, Chief Junior David Martin will retire from the force, after 29 years of extraordinary service. He will be sorely missed. A graduate of San Luis Obispo Junior College, Chief Martin began his career with CHP in March of 1956. His superiors took note of his abilities and talents, and Junior was steadily promoted. Martin realized the importance of education and continued to attend school when he was able, specializing in law enforcement and supervisory training. In 1970, he was promoted to captain, and then in 1973, inspector.

Chief Martin is a caring man, one who values human life and has dedicated his career to protecting it. One of his special concerns is the drunk driver. With help from a friend, Martin was instrumental in organizing a television campaign aimed at potential drunk drivers. This amazing venture featured Bob "Highway Patrol" Hope and reached countless citizens. All this was done at no cost to the California Highway Patrol. Chief Martin was also extremely active in other television spots on driver safety. Clearly, we have all benefited from the concern and actions of people like Junior Martin.

Junior currently resides in Redlands, CA, with his wife of 32 years, Betty Mae. They are the proud parents of three children: Cynthia, Sandra, and Robert, and also have four grandchildren. Junior is the president of the Uptown Kiwanis Mason Order, and he takes an active interest in cultural programs throughout neighboring communities. His hobbies include golf, fishing, hunting, and wood working.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask you and my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, to join me, along with family, friends, and fellow officers of the California Highway Patrol, in honoring a truly remarkable man on his retirement. Chief Junior David Martin's selfless contributions to the safety and well being of his fellow citizens will cause him to be remembered dearly as one of California's, indeed, one of our Nation's finest. ●

WASTE AND ABUSE IN DEFENSE

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, In January of this year, The International Association of Machinist and Aerospace Workers published a story in their trade magazine, The Machinist (p. 3, number 9, vol. XXXIX), about the billions of dollars of taxpayer's funds wasted each year in Defense procurement. They raised a number of excellent examples of how this rip-off occurs. I would like to share these examples with my distinguished colleagues in order to emphasize the need to continually monitor rampant defense waste.

One of the biggest areas of waste in the defense procurement area is in the salaries paid to top management personnel in the aerospace industry.

Twelve leading aerospace firms were studied by the Government Accounting Office. Their study revealed that executive pay, defined as a salary and a bonus, averaged 42 percent more than the average salary and bonus at comparably sized firms in other businesses. The study also revealed that the union employees and other hourly workers are earning just slightly over the national average.

In 1983, for instance, Boeing Chairman T.A. Wilson earned \$873,000 just in salary and bonus. This compares with 475,000 for Chrysler's Lee Iacocca and Eastern Airlines Frank Borman who earned \$282,000 in salary and bonus.

Representative JACK BROOKS, Chair of the House Government Operations Committee, concluded that executive pay in the aerospace industry is bloated.

BROOKS noted the study also found that executives "also receive noncash prerequisites, including stock options, use of automobiles, social club memberships, and free travel for spouses. Most of these benefits are paid for by the taxpayer as they are charged as part of the cost of doing defense business."●

JOE SWANNER, SERVANT OF
THE PEOPLE**HON. BILL ALEXANDER**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it's a mighty big bureaucracy we try to keep track of on this Hill. At last count, 2,909,899 people worked for the gargantuan enterprise known as the Federal Government.

The overwhelming majority of our Federal workers are dedicated and we

should be proud of all of them. But there are some among these multitudes who stand out. Joe Swanner is one such man.

Joe retired recently after more than half a lifetime in Federal service. That service began on the floor of this body when he was a clerk assisting with the House Journal. Joe ended his career in Austin, TX, after a 12-year stint as Regional Administrator for the Economic Development Administration.

The plain fact about Joe Swanner is that he was a professional servant of the people, and, Mr. Speaker, there just aren't many nobler things to be.

He didn't stay in Government that long for the money. Lord knows he could have made more in the private sector.

He didn't stay in for fame, for he is not a household word.

He didn't stay in because he was on a power trip; on the contrary, he was there to help.

Joe realized that Government, when done well, has a tremendous ability to do good for ordinary people. For that reason, he loved and cherished Government, and spent his career in it.

He realized that it was Government that could help the businesses, the communities and the people of the five States in the Southwestern region of EDA leave behind a history of poverty, ignorance, and underdevelopment and enter an era of prosperity, education, and employment. Not through handouts, you understand, but through programs which helped businesses get on their feet, stay there, and create jobs.

I guess the best thing you can say about Joe Swanner is that he reached the goal all of us in Federal service should always aspire to—he truly cared.●

TRIBUTE TO LELAND C. AYERS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of the community of Burbank, CA. Mr. Leland C. Ayers will be concluding his last term on the Burbank City Council in April of this year. Leland is the only councilman ever to be elected to three terms in Burbank. He has also served as mayor.

We have not always agreed on the issues of the day, but I have always found Leland Ayers to be a man of strength, leadership and the highest integrity. Above all he has had a single-minded determination to fight for what he thought was right for Burbank.

Throughout his career on the Burbank City Council he has always

shown a willingness to give freely of his time to aid important community organizations. While serving as mayor or council member, from 1976 to the present, and running his own business, he has also found time to serve as commissioner on the Los Angeles County Emergency Care Commission. In 1973, Mr. Ayers served as the chairman of the Burbank Chapter of the American Red Cross. He currently serves on the board of directors of St. Joseph Medical Center.

It has been my pleasure and honor to work with Leland Ayers. His commitment to public service has helped to make Burbank the fine city it is today.●

A TRIBUTE TO RUTH FISHER
FOUNDER, CANCER VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA**HON. NORMAN F. LENT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in paying tribute today to an upstanding citizen and community leader, Ruth Fisher of Great Neck, NY. On April 13, 1985, Ruth's many family, friends, and colleagues will honor her at a dinner dance to be held at the Swan Club, in Glenwood Landing, NY.

On May 31, 1979, Ruth Fisher founded the Cancer Volunteers of America [CVA]. CVA is an independent, nonprofit, charitable organization operated completely by volunteers. The organization was formed for the sole purpose of providing financial assistance and services to cancer patients, many of whom are children, and their families. All donated funds are distributed directly to the patients and their families. The CVA also contributes financial aid to numerous cancer patient service programs throughout the local community.

The CVA proudly offers many free services to cancer patients, including a 24-hour emergency hotline, aid in the purchase of modern home-hospital equipment, counseling, blood banks, and donor programs, group and individual therapy, drug assistance, health guidance, referrals. The list of programs and services CVA offers is almost endless.

As an honorary member of the CVA, I can personally attest to the commitment and dedicated work of the CVA volunteers. These volunteers are reaching out to help others in their time of need because they care.

The fight against cancer can be a long and difficult struggle. But with advanced medical technology, real progress in the battle against cancer is being made. With proper care and treatment, many cancer patients are

beating the odds and are able to return to living normal, healthy lives.

Still, for many cancer patients and their families, the financial and emotional strain of a long-term illness can become overwhelming at times. The CVA lends financial assistance, guidance, and emotional support to help patients and their loved ones through these difficult periods. The CVA and its volunteers provide an important service of inestimable value. We owe Ruth Fisher our deepest gratitude and appreciation for all her hard work and dedication to serving others through the CVA.

The Ruth Fisher Cancer Scholarship Fund of the CVA has recently been established in her honor as the organization's founder. The scholarship fund is awarded annually to a deserving student pursuing a medical career and in need of financial assistance.

Ruth's volunteer work spans a career of over 25 years of public service. She is president of the Ladies of Charity for the Sisters of Mercy; an advisory board member of the Kline School, Huntingdon, CA; and a member of the Children to Children Foundation, Washington, DC.

Ruth Fisher is an outstanding American who has dedicated her life to helping others. Her commitment to public and community service and her many years of noteworthy achievements are worthy of the highest commendation.

I know I speak for Ruth's many friends and colleagues in extending my heartfelt appreciation and best wishes for continued success.●

THE LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would establish a commission to review the civil service—a so-called Little Hoover Commission. This legislation is identical to an initiative I sponsored in the 98th Congress which I believe is even more critical today.

We marked the 100th anniversary of the creation of today's civil service in 1983. With over a century of history and experience in the course and direction of government and with the overwhelming number of proposals which continue to face the Congress in a piecemeal fashion which would significantly alter the structure of the civil service, I believe we must establish a commission to formulate recommendations for the future course of the civil service system.

My legislation would establish a commission to investigate, study, and

make recommendations on changes in the U.S. civil service system. The panel would be organized in a similar fashion as the Truman-appointed Hoover Commissions of 1947 and 1952 which included appointees by the House and Senate leadership and President Truman who studied the organization and functions of the executive branch of government.

Just in the past few months, Congress has received budget proposals from the administration, which, if adopted would have far-reaching effects on the quality of government services rendered to the American taxpayer. Before such radical changes in the direction of the Federal Government are accepted within the limited timeframe of the congressional budget cycle, I am proposing that a Little Hoover Commission be established to provide a broad, objective perspective on current budget issues and to review the pending initiatives and cost effectiveness of current personnel practices. Among the issues to be addressed would be civil service retirement and its funding, Federal employees personnel policies, appropriate levels of pay and benefits, and other vital issues which go to the heart of Federal employment and the civil service's ability to render quality services to the American people. While this should not be viewed as an attempt to avoid dealing with the problems at hand, this Commission would provide an opportunity to assemble the necessary data and material to examine those proposals which could have such far-reaching impact on an effective civil service.

In order to make the long-term realistic proposals for the civil service and the future of our country, this Commission must be composed of men and women who are leaders in their fields and whose records in private and public sector employment would provide the necessary objectivity and experience. All appointments would be the prerogative of the appointing Members of the congressional leadership and the President of the United States.

Only by working in a bipartisan manner can we hope to address and solve these issues equitably and effectively. This Commission would be strictly bipartisan in makeup and comprised of individuals who can make recommendations to the Congress and President in a timely manner.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the establishment of this Commission.●

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE OPTIONS FOR FEDERAL RETIREES

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation that would allow retired Federal employees who retired before December 9, 1980, to elect to resume coverage under the Federal employees' group life insurance program [FEGLI]. In 1980 the Congress approved major reforms for Federal employees covered by group life insurance, but employees who retired before these reforms were enacted do not have these necessary options available to them.

I have met with constituents who made me aware of the problems they have experienced with the current law. It is very difficult and costly for a 65- to 70-year-old person to obtain life insurance. In some cases, retirees have found that their life insurance decreased in value by \$6,000 in 1 year. Unfortunately, Federal retirees, who left Government service before the 1980 reforms, did not have the opportunity to maintain their life insurance at full value.

My bill would allow pre-1980 Federal retirees the following options now available to all Federal retirees: One, pay no premiums after retirement and allow their policy to be reduced to 25 percent; two, pay premiums that will allow their policy to be reduced to 50 percent; three, pay premiums to maintain their life insurance at 100 percent of its full value. The mandatory reduction formula used before 1980 leaves many retirees with very inadequate life insurance protection.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE DEL BIANCO FAMILY

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1985

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, this great country of ours means many things to many people. It is a land of freedom and opportunity representing the hopes of countless people. It is the home of the American dream.

For centuries now, people of different ancestries have come to this Nation. They arrive with dreams of success and the boundless ambition necessary to realize these dreams. The combination of these hard-working, determined people and the opportunities that this country offers them have resulted in many success stories.

Today, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the 50th anniversary of Lucca's Restaurant in Madera, CA. This event reflects one such success story.

Georgio Del Bianco arrived in the United States in 1906. He went to work in the San Joaquin Valley and then returned to Italy to get married. He and his wife, Lela, returned together to start their new life in this land.

After working for a time as a foreman on a ranch, Georgio purchased some land as an investment. On April 11, 1935, he opened an Italian food dining room on this land.

The Del Biancos had two sons and as soon as they could clear tables, they became a part of the business. In 1948, the two brothers, Sirio and Elmo, and their wives, Vickie and Anna, bought the restaurant from the elder Del Biancos.

The restaurant underwent expansion and improvement throughout the years. Then, in 1973, an unfortunate fire gutted the building.

The family handled this hardship like they handled others, they pulled together and overcame the tragedy. In less than 16 months, they had reopened Lucca's Restaurant.

The family has worked hard and long to make Lucca's what it is today. The restaurant is an institution in Madera and throughout the San Joaquin Valley. It is a meeting place for good food and good company.

On April 11, 1985, the Del Bianco family will have owned and operated the Lucca's Restaurant for 50 years. This is indeed a noteworthy accomplishment. Georgio and Lela Del Bianco, starting out as Italian immigrants with nothing but a desire to succeed, came to this country and fulfilled their American dream. I would like to join in offering my congratulations to them. ●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 2, 1985, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 3

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

Closed business meeting, to continue markup of S. 674, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Defense.

SR-222

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on the nominations of Henrietta F. Guiton, of California, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Rate Commission, and John N. Griesemer, of Missouri, to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service.

SD-342

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for the peanut industry.

SR-328A

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Labor and Human Resources' Subcommittee on the Handicapped on the care and advocacy for mentally disabled persons in institutions.

SR-428A

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of State, and the U.S. Information Agency.

SD-116

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to examine corporate takeovers.

SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-G50

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the U.S. International Trade Commission, U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

SD-215

Judiciary

Security and Terrorism Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources Handicapped Subcommittee

To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies on the care and advocacy for mentally disabled persons in institutions.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for certain defense programs, focusing on defense manpower programs.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Secret Service, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, all of the Department of the Treasury.

SD-124

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on the availability of environmental impairment insurance and its relation to the implementation of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (Superfund) (P.L. 96-510), and the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (P.L. 98-616).

SD-406

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to continue markup of S. 659, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury.

SD-124

Judiciary

To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Governmental Affairs

Business meeting, to consider the nomination of Donald J. Devine, of Maryland, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

SD-342

3:00 p.m.

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending committee business.

SD-226

APRIL 4

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

Closed business meeting, to continue markup of S. 674, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Defense.

SR-222

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for the food for peace program and export industry.

SR-328A

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, the Marine Mammal Commission, and the Small Business Administration.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings to examine corporate takeovers.

SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To continue hearings in closed session on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SD-124

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury, focusing on multilateral development banks.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-116

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for Conrail, U.S. Railway Association, and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

SD-138

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up S. 53 and S. 652, bills authorizing funds for programs of the Clean Water Act.

SD-406

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on nomination of Herbert B. Dixon, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

SD-342

Judiciary

Business meeting, to consider pending committee business.

SD-226

Joint Economic

To hold hearings to review public attitudes on the Federal budget deficit and Federal tax reform proposals.

2359 Rayburn Building

10:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To continue hearings in open session on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

1:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To resume hearings on the proposed sale by the Department of Transportation of Conrail.

SR-253

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic

To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for March.

SD-538

APRIL 15

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To resume hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for conservation programs.

SR-328A

1:30 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 667, authorizing funds for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-538

2:00 p.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for research and extension programs.

SR-328A

April 1, 1985

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of the Secretary of Education, Departmental Management (salaries and expenses), Office for Civil Rights, and Office of Inspector General, all of the Department of Education.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the effect of new technologies in industrial competitiveness.

SR-253

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1985.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for certain defense programs, focusing on Navy shipbuilding and conversion.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 725, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 through 1990 for programs of the Endangered Species Act.

SD-406

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings on the status of the U.S. Government personnel security system.

SD-342

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research, special institutions, including Howard University, bilingual education, and adult and vocational education programs.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Justice, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the effect of new technologies in industrial competitiveness.

SR-253

Finance

To hold hearings to review an Administration report on prospective payment for skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare program.

SD-215

Labor and Human Resources

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the International Labor Organization.

SD-430

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

SD-124

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SD-538

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings on the status of the U.S. Government personnel security system.

SD-342

APRIL 18

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To resume hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on agribusiness.

SR-328A

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Pollution Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 725, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 through 1990 for programs of the Endangered Species Act.

SD-406

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To continue hearings on the status of the U.S. Government personnel security system.

SD-342

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

SD-138

APRIL 19

10:30 a.m.

Finance

Health Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings of the Peer Review organizations.

SD-215

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including elementary and secondary education, education block grants, impact aid, research and statistics, and libraries.

SD-116

Rules and Administration

To resume hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1985.

SR-301

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury, U.S. Postal Service, and General Government programs.

SD-138

Rules and Administration

To continue hearings on Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1985.

SR-301

APRIL 24

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To resume hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for rural credit programs.

SR-328A

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including student financial assistance, guaranteed

student loans, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loans and insurance, college housing loans, educational research and training.

SD-116

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, the Legal Services Corporation, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-124

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Merchant Marine Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the consolidation of certain trade routes.

SR-232

APRIL 25

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs.

SR-328A

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for ACTION (domestic programs), Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and National Council on the Handicapped.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings in conjunction with the National Ocean Policy Study on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Fisheries Conservation and Management Act and fishery programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

SR-253

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for rail safety programs.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-124

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on atomic energy defense activities.

SD-116

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Management and Budget, including the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

SD-138

10:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1985.

SR-301

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Indian Education, and the Institute of Museum Services.

SD-138

APRIL 26

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Civil Service, Post Office, and General Services Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review options for conducting a pay equity study of the Federal pay and classification systems.

SD-342

APRIL 29

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for Amtrak.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the health prevention/promotion for Medicare beneficiaries.

SD-215

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Prospective Payment Commission, Railroad

Retirement Board, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, OSHA Review Commission, and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

SD-116

Environment and Public Works

To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia on global forecasting capability.

SD-342

Governmental Affairs

Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Environment and Public Works on global forecasting capability.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.

SD-124

MAY 1

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

Room to be announced

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Supreme Court of the United States, and the U.S. District Courts.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

SD-124

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the General Services Administration.

SD-138

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.

SD-124

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for territorial affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MAY 3

10:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings in conjunction with the National Ocean Policy Study on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Coastal Zone Management Act and ocean programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

SR-253

MAY 6

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for rail safety programs of the Department of Transportation.

SR-253

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the

April 1, 1985

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

7007

Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-406

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 9

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-406

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and

Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Energy Information Administration, and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.

SD-138

Governmental Affairs

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 483, to ensure that the Federal Government assume the full cost of legislating and regulating Federal purposes and mandates.

SD-342

MAY 15

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 21

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

MAY 23

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for Naval Petroleum Reserves, and fossil energy.

SD-138

OCTOBER 1

11:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.

SD-106

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 2

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 3

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 6, to clarify and improve certain health-care programs and services provided and administered by the Veterans' Administration, and related proposals.

SR-418

